



Class JK1801

Book 1910

A1a

copy 2





HEARINGS

BEFORE

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SIXTY-FIRST CONGRESS.

574
223

COMMITTEE

BENJ. F. HOWELL, N. J., *Chairman.*

AUGUSTUS P. GARDNER, Massachusetts.

POLITTE ELVINS, Missouri.

WILLIAM S. BENNET, New York.

JOHN L. BURNETT, Alabama.

EVERIS A. HAYES, California.

JOHN M. MOORE, Texas.

J. HAMPTON MOORE, Pennsylvania.

JOHN A. M. ADAIR, Indiana.

DON C. EDWARDS, Kentucky.

ADOLPH J. SABATH, Illinois.

GUSTAV KÜSTERMANN, Wisconsin.

JOSEPH F. O'CONNELL, Massachusetts.

ADNA R. JOHNSON, Ohio.

HENRY M. GOLDFOGLE, New York.

C. S. ATKINSON, *Clerk.*

.

WASHINGTON

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

1910

Copy ✓

JK1861

1910

Ala

Copy 2

JUL 23 1910

2 OF 2

HEARING ON NATURALIZATION BILLS.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Thursday, January 20, 1910.

The committee met at 10.30 o'clock a. m., Hon Benjamin F. Howell (chairman) presiding, having under consideration H. R. 14574, H. R. 14575, and H. R. 14576.

Others present were Representatives Hayes, Bennet, Küstermann, Burnett, Sabath, Moore of Texas, Johnson, and Goldfogle.

Mr. BENNET. As chairman of the subcommittee, I wrote to Representative Howland and asked him to be here to-day so that we could hear him on his bills. Since then the hearing has been changed to the full committee, and I now take great pleasure in introducing Representative Howland.

STATEMENT OF HON. PAUL HOWLAND, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OHIO.

Mr. HOWLAND. In response to the courteous words of Representative Bennet, I wish to say that it is a pleasure to be before the committee. But I desire at the outset to say that I do not come before you as an expert on this subject at all, but my attention has been called to this subject, and facts have come within my personal knowledge, in the execution of the laws in regard to registration, which, it seems to me, calls for action by this committee, and to the best of my ability I have embodied these suggestions in these three bills. I will first call your attention to H. R. 14574. That is a slight amendment to section 2166 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. HAYES. Have you the statutes there, so that we can hear what the law is?

Mr. HOWLAND. Yes; I have them in this pamphlet, which is up to date. Twenty-one sixty-six is the statute, and I will read it.

SEC. 2166. Any alien, of the age of twenty-one years and upward, who has enlisted, or may enlist, in the armies of the United States, either the regular or the volunteer forces, and has been, or may be hereafter, honorably discharged shall be admitted to become a citizen of the United States, upon his petition, without any previous declaration of his intention to become such; and he shall not be required to prove more than one year's residence within the United States previous to his application to become such citizen; and the court admitting such alien shall, in addition to such proof of residence and good moral character, as now provided by law, be satisfied by competent proof of such person having been honorably discharged from the service of the United States.

This provides for the honorably discharged veteran, and does away with the necessity of filing a declaration of intention, authorizing him to become a citizen upon proof of his discharge.

Mr. BURNETT. Did you read all of the section, Mr. Howland?

Mr. HOWLAND. I read all of the section. My amendment simply extends to the children of honorably discharged veterans the same privilege which is extended to the veterans. This condition of affairs has been developed within my personal knowledge in the city of Cleveland. Many a man came to this country in early manhood and brought with him a family of young children. He enlisted in the Army of the United States, was honorably discharged therefrom; and immediately following the civil war honorably discharged soldiers were allowed to vote all over the northern part of the country, anyway, upon the mere production of their discharge papers or the general knowledge that they were soldiers in the civil war.

Mr. BENNET. You do not contend that they are permitted legally to vote?

Mr. HOWLAND. No; not at all. They were permitted by the general consensus of opinion, the sentiment in their communities; no, not legally. They have to take out their papers under the law; but that was not done. I am telling you the practice. Now, within the last three or four years a stricter enforcement of the registration laws, throughout our State at least, has been carried out, and before an elector can register, if he is foreign born, he must produce his naturalization papers. This has resulted in establishing the legal status of many an honorably discharged soldier as an alien. They had no right to register. You demand the production of his papers, and he will come in and bring out his honorable discharge from the Army of the United States and ask to be registered on that, but of course the election officers would say no, and he would have to go and file his petition in the United States court or other court of competent jurisdiction and get out his papers before he could be registered as a qualified elector. Of course, having voted for years and years and years by the general sentiment of the community, which never questioned his right, as his children grew up to manhood they were permitted to vote also, and there are many cases in Cleveland where the father having voted for years has been found to be an alien under the strict interpretation of the law, and the children also are aliens, having been born in the foreign country, coming here as mere children, and as the law now stands they have to file a declaration of intention, then two years later, I think it is, get their final papers. Many of these men are old men to-day, having held office and exercised the franchise from the time they became 21 years of age. It is to meet that condition of affairs, gentlemen of the committee, that I have suggested an amendment to section 2166, which appears on page 2, line 5, of H. R. 14574.

Mr. HAYES. From line 5 to the end.

Mr. HOWLAND. Yes; "and the children of such honorably discharged alien, of the age of twenty-one years and upward, shall be entitled to the same privilege, upon the same proof of residence, good moral character, and the honorable discharge of the parent from the service of the United States."

Mr. BURNETT. That would not relieve the status of the alien himself?

Mr. HOWLAND. Oh, no; the alien himself has to comply with the law. I extend the privilege to the children; that is all.

Mr. BENNET. That is, the soldier alien. Of course, they are both aliens.

Mr. BURNETT. That is what I mean; I mean the original.

Mr. HOWLAND. That would not change his status, and has nothing to do with it. He must file his petition. I am simply giving the children of the alien veteran the same privilege extended to him, and it seems to me it ought to be done, to the best of my judgment.

Mr. BURNETT. May I ask you one word about that? That would be without reference to the time he had been here. An alien would come over here and stay one year, and he would be entitled to file this application. Now, then, the children would be entitled to the filing of it after the father had been here for one year, would they not?

Mr. HOWLAND. The children of the honorably discharged alien are to be entitled to the same privileges, on the same proof that their father has. Now, understand, this amendment can not apply to recent conditions, because the act of March 2, 1899, provides that none but citizens of the United States can enlist. So this law only cures conditions away back in civil war times. It does not apply and can not apply to conditions now, because the act of March 2, 1899, prohibits the enlistment in the army, in time of peace, anyway of any persons who are not citizens.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Howland, ought not the word "heretofore" be inserted in line 6, on page 2, between "such" and "honorably," so as to confine it to the class you mean?

Mr. HAYES. So as to make it not apply to the future.

Mr. HOWLAND. "The children of such heretofore honorably discharged aliens." I have no objection to that whatever, because the class I am trying to reach is a class that is brought into existence by the past conditions and can never come into existence now.

Mr. BENNET. You see, if you did not put that in you might naturalize a man who had lived in this country only one year.

Mr. HOWLAND. Yes; if he was a son of an honorably discharged soldier.

Mr. BENNET. As the chairman has called my attention, Mr. Howland, it would be conferring a greater privilege on a son of the veteran than on the veteran himself.

Mr. HOWLAND. I do not want to do that.

Mr. BENNET. Because the veteran has to serve three years.

Mr. HOWLAND. "Such heretofore honorably discharged alien," in line 6. That is not objectionable to me at all. I want it to apply to that class of people, because many of these people are old men now, have exercised a franchise in Cleveland for years and years, and all of a sudden they are held to be aliens. It is a most embarrassing and distressing condition for those men, and it is a large class of men, and a great many of them are my German friends in Cleveland. Whether they were imbued with the military spirit in the old days I do not know. I am now talking for the benefit of my friend Mr. Küstermann.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I thank you.

Mr. HOWLAND. But it is true; I know that of my own personal knowledge.

Mr. BURNETT. Let me ask you there again: Those last three lines, "shall be entitled to the same privilege, upon the same proof of

residence, good moral character, and the honorable discharge of the parent from the service of the United States." That might be construed to mean that all this man had to do was to prove good moral character and residence and an honorable discharge of the parent, when the child certainly ought to prove good moral character himself.

Mr. HOWLAND. That is the intention.

Mr. BURNETT. Of course that is the intention.

Mr. HOWLAND. If it does not mean it, it ought to be changed.

Mr. JOHNSON. You say that same proof relates to the children.

Mr. HOWLAND. On the same proof of residence.

Mr. BURNETT. It might not under the construction there, the verbal arrangement of it; it might not require the children to prove good moral character.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I think that is right.

Mr. BENNET. Conversely, the child might have to prove honorable discharge from the army.

Mr. BURNETT. Exactly. I think it is susceptible of those constructions.

Mr. BENNET. It ought to be a little more specific.

Mr. HOWLAND. It has to be the same proof. I have no pride of authorship in this, as they say around here. I want this committee to take hold of this question which I bring up here and give these people some relief. They are entitled to it. Now do it any way you can, and I will be satisfied.

Now, 14575 is applying practically the same rule to honorably discharged sailors and members of the Marine Corps.

Mr. HAYES. This applies to the future?

Mr. BENNET. "Who may enlist."

Mr. HAYES. It is not the same as the one you have just discussed.

Mr. HOWLAND. Yes; that is right—"who may hereafter be honorably discharged."

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. That is the same as in 14574—"or may be hereafter."

Mr. BENNET. But we changed it. You see, we did not change section 2166, except by making it apply to children.

Mr. HAYES. This is an entirely new provision?

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Howland consents to the "heretofore."

Mr. HOWLAND. This does apply to the future.

Mr. BENNET. Excuse me just one moment. The purpose of 14575 is simply to give the Navy and Marine Corps the same privileges the Army has?

Mr. HOWLAND. That is it exactly.

Mr. BURNETT. But it does not exist under the law now.

Mr. HAYES. Can aliens enlist in the Marine Corps now?

Mr. HOWLAND. Not now.

Mr. HAYES. Then the rule should be the same in both cases.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. They do, however. When I went to the incoming of the fleet there I asked the captain of our derelict destroyer whether he had any aliens there, and it finally came out that about half of his men were not citizens of the United States. He said: "We simply had to take them because we can not get others." So it is all right on paper, but in fact it is not so.

Mr. BENNET. How is that, Colonel Lauchheimer?

Colonel LAUCHHEIMER. We are not enlisting them now, but we have done so.

Mr. BENNET. If an alien enlisted fifteen or twenty years ago in the Marine Corps he is permitted to reenlist?

Colonel LAUCHHEIMER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURNETT. You are not enlisting them now unless they comply with the laws of Congress as to the declaration?

Colonel LAUCHHEIMER. No, sir.

Mr. HAYES. So that this would cure it—just the same provision as we suggested for 14574?

Mr. BENNET. "Heretofore?"

Mr. HAYES. Yes, "heretofore;" that would fix this just the same as the other one without extending it into the future.

Mr. BURNETT. Only the declaration is necessary, I suppose. If they do not follow that up by becoming naturalized citizens, do you still continue them?

Colonel LAUCHHEIMER. We keep up our contract of enlisting them; yes, sir.

Mr. BENNET. There is this to be said, that under the 1906 statute it is pretty hard now for an alien in the service to be naturalized.

Mr. HAYES. While he is the service.

Mr. BENNET. Because he has to prove a year's continuous residence in a place by two witnesses who have known him five years.

Mr. JOHNSON. Would that continuous residence not just go right along from the place he enlisted from?

Mr. BENNET. I do not think it has been so construed.

Mr. JOHNSON. It seems to be actual residence that is meant.

Mr. BENNET. Actual residence. How is that, Mr. Campbell?

Mr. RICHARD K. CAMPBELL. It has been construed both ways. The general construction favored by the courts now is that the act of June 29, 1906, has no relation whatever to these excepted classes, and some of them have been naturalized without any reference to the terms of that act.

Mr. JOHNSON. Should there not be an exception, gentlemen, to a person who is in the navy?

Mr. HAYES. It seems to me a year's residence on shipboard ought to be a year's residence in the United States.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That does not give them such residence as to enable the courts to take jurisdiction.

Mr. BENNET. I have asked the representatives of the Army and Navy and the Marine Corps to be here, and I suggest we take that up after Mr. Howland gets through.

Mr. HOWLAND. With reference to this Army, Navy, and Marine Corps proposition, I found in looking that up that that law was carried in an appropriation bill.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is, 14576?

Mr. HOWLAND. 14575. That is carried in the appropriation bill, act of July 26, 1894. Consequently I could not amend that appropriation bill very well, so we had to introduce an original section.

Mr. BURNETT. What was provided in that legislation in the appropriation bill?

Mr. HOWLAND (reading):

Any alien of the age of twenty-one years and upward who has enlisted, or may enlist, in the United States Navy or Marine Corps, and has served or may hereafter serve five

consecutive years in the United States Navy or one enlistment in the United States Marine Corps, and has been or may hereafter be honorably discharged, shall be admitted to become a citizen of the United States upon his petition, without any previous declaration of his intention to become such; and the court admitting such alien shall, in addition to proof of good moral character, be satisfied by competent proof of such person's service in and honorable discharge from the United States Navy or Marine Corps.

Mr. BENNET. Then this act of yours just simply extends that privilege to the children?

Mr. HOWLAND. That is all; absolutely uses the same language right down through, but extends the same privilege to the children.

Mr. HAYES. What is the date of that appropriation bill?

Mr. HOWLAND. July 26, 1894, 28 Statutes at Large, 124.

Mr. BURNETT. Why is the five years' consecutive service required in that and not in the army?

Mr. BENNET. There are three different periods, one for the Army, one for the Navy, and one for the Marine Corps.

Mr. BURNETT. Why?

Mr. BENNET. Because they were passed at different times, and no one paid any attention to it. That is pretty frank, I guess.

Mr. BURNETT. I am inclined to believe the five years' proposition ought to apply to all of them.

Mr. HOWLAND. Now, gentlemen, one more matter. I thought it was only fair to treat the Army and the Navy and the Marine Corps on a parity with each other.

Mr. BURNETT. But they have not been so treated.

Mr. HOWLAND. No; they have not been so treated, that is apparent. But I think they ought to be. H. R. 14756 is the next bill, which amends section 2172, Revised Statutes, and that is, perhaps, just a little complicated, and if you would care to have me read that section as it now stands I will do so.

Mr. BURNETT. Before you pass from this other, let me call your attention to one thing. This soldier, the one who served in the Navy or the Marine Corps, must have served for five consecutive years. That child may have been on the other side of the water all that time, and he can come right over here, and, without staying here the length of time that his father was required to serve, can be admitted, can he not?

Mr. HOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. Do you think that is right?

Mr. HOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. That the child that has been on the other side all that time——

Mr. HOWLAND. I do not care where he has been.

Mr. BURNETT (continuing). And knows nothing of our laws or the nature of our institutions, should come over here and, merely because his father served five years, ought to be admitted into naturalization at once?

Mr. HOWLAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURNETT. The labor would be on you to convince me that that is right.

Mr. HOWLAND. A man who has fought here for five years in the service of the Army of the United States I think would be able to take care of a son.

Mr. BURNETT. That is not the question. It is whether he is qualified for citizenship—to be naturalized.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Burnett, if an alien comes here and stays here five years and is naturalized, when his oldest son is 20 years and 6 months old, and the boy comes over here, immediately he becomes a citizen and can vote within six months.

Mr. BURNETT. That would be governed by the state laws.

Mr. BENNET. I mean he becomes a citizen within six months, by the naturalization of his father.

Mr. JOHNSON. Should not the age limit be put in here, then?

Mr. BENNET. That is governed by the general law. There is a limit in which they can start in to be naturalized, under the general statutes.

Mr. HOWLAND. Now I will take up 14576.

Mr. HAYES. Read section 2172.

Mr. HOWLAND. This is quite a complicated section (reading):

SEC. 2172. The children of persons who have been duly naturalized under any law of the United States, or who, previous to the passing of any law on that subject by the Government of the United States, may have become citizens of any one of the States, under the laws thereof, being under the age of twenty-one years at the time of the naturalization of their parents, shall, if dwelling in the United States, be considered as citizens thereof; and the children of persons who now are or have been citizens of the United States, shall, though born out of the limits and jurisdiction of the United States, be considered as citizens thereof; but no person heretofore proscribed by any State, or who has been legally convicted of having joined the army of Great Britain during the Revolutionary war, shall be admitted to become a citizen without the consent of the legislature of the State in which such person was proscribed.

On page 2 of H. R. 14576, line 2, right after “thereof” insert the following language:

Any infant coming to the United States under fifteen years of age, and who has thereafter resided in the United States for a period of twenty-one years, shall be admitted to become a citizen of the United States upon his petition, in accordance with the procedure in such case made and provided without any previous declaration of his intention, upon proof of his residence, good moral character, and upon further showing that he does not belong to any nationality or race not entitled to become citizens of the United States; but no person heretofore proscribed by any State shall be admitted to become a citizen without the consent of the legislature of the State in which such person was proscribed.

Mr. JOHNSON. How about that last provision?

Mr. HAYES. That does not need to be there, does it?

Mr. HOWLAND. What is that?

Mr. HAYES. That applied to Revolutionary times.

Mr. HOWLAND. I left out the particular reference to the Revolutionary times.

Mr. BENNET. The States have no power to proscribe.

Mr. HOWLAND. I left out the Revolutionary fellows. This situation exists, has developed with us to a certain extent, and I have no doubt it has developed in other places, where the franchise is granted to those who have taken out their declaration of intention. Many men have been voting on their declaration of intention in New York.

Mr. HAYES. There are seven States where they do still.

Mr. HOWLAND. Many people, it has developed, believed that their declaration of intention papers were naturalization papers, and they have been voting on declaration papers for a great many years, with us anyway, until this enforcement of the law of registration in our State has developed this peculiar condition of affairs.

Mr. BURNETT. Then let me ask you, is not that matter subject to legislation by your State, a sort of enabling act to enable them to go in? Your State insists they do not want them to vote. Ought we to come along and nullify your state laws by this kind of a law? Your State could easily amend that, if they thought they ought to vote. Why can they not, by some kind of enabling act, allow them to be excepted?

Mr. HOWLAND. That might be, but the United States is legislating along this line. Do not confuse franchise and citizenship. The United States has jurisdiction in the matter of citizenship. That is what I thought, and I thought a son of a man who has been voting under these circumstances for a great many years, had lived here for twenty-one years and was qualified in every respect for citizenship, ought to have his papers on his petition.

Now, I am taking more time here than I intended on these matters, but in closing what I have to say, I submit this matter to your hands, and I want to just read you a letter from the secretary of our board of elections there in Cleveland, who is a man exceptionally well qualified to speak upon all these questions. He has given the subject great study, and in all fairness to him, I must say that this legislation is really at his suggestion. I sent him copies of the bills after I had introduced them, and here is what he says:

BOARD OF DEPUTY STATE SUPERVISORS AND INSPECTORS OF ELECTIONS,
Cleveland, Ohio, January 9, 1910.

Hon. PAUL HOWLAND, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HOWLAND: I am in receipt of yours of December 16, 1909, with the inclosures of H. R. 14574, H. R. 14575, and H. R. 14576. I regret that official business here prevented my acknowledgment of same prior to this date.

Those bills have met with such universal approval here and my official experiences have so interested me that I ask your forbearance if I try to impress upon you some of my official experiences in connection with the election machinery of this city and county as to that feature of the law. You know, as secretary to this board for the past six years, it has been my duty to meet with thousands of complaining cases dealing upon naturalization, which is most natural under the existing laws in a city where about one-third of the voting population are foreign born. In 1907 our registration records show 32,117 foreign born. In 1909, 28,585. The decrease is due to the fact that the law regarding the production of certificates of naturalization or evidences thereof have been strictly enforced.

I have had communications during the past two years with thousands of clerks of courts throughout the United States endeavoring to assist those who claimed citizenship and to obtain certified copies of their naturalization papers, and was thus able to trace several hundred. Our troubles here, however, were mainly where men claimed citizenship by their father's naturalization, who knew nothing of, neither the place, date, nor court where their fathers were naturalized, except that they have seen their fathers vote. These men, from 21 to 70 years old, were deprived of their votes because they could tell nothing further except that they thought their fathers were citizens. Under existing laws they would be required to make a declaration of intention, wait two years, and then file a petition, which is on file for ninety days, before they could be admitted to citizenship. In addition I may say not 5 per cent would be able to give the information required to obtain either a declaration of intention or final letters of citizenship. I also found a large number of men who have arrived in this country during their infancy, or at all events boyhood days, who have since changed their names, or, in other words, Americanized their ill-sounding or unpronounceable names to one that would more suit to American pronunciation, and of whom, of course, only about 1 per cent have had the good judgment to do so by proper process of law.

Again, hundreds of cases in which men have exercised the right of franchise by the common error of assumption that a soldier having served in either the army or

navy of this Government became a citizen by his oath when entering same. Consequently, the sons until now have been permitted to vote, some of whom now have reached the age of 60 and over.

Your bills would, in my judgment, remedy all of the above-mentioned evils, and with the slightest degree of inconvenience enable all such that desire to take advantage of the same to forever settle the question of their citizenship.

It is hardly fair to assume that those 3,532 who have not registered this year have heretofore taken advantage of the laxity of the enforcement of the above-mentioned law and were not eligible to vote. My personal opinion on the matter is that not being able to produce the necessary evidences they would rather remain away from the polls than have their honesty questioned, and yet the right to citizenship was so circuitous and with so many obstacles in the way that they could not undertake to obtain the same. I have felt, and do now feel, very keenly the responsibility if, perchance, we have under those conditions deprived those who were honestly entitled to their vote. I may add that I have had about fifty or more cases in which the records of naturalization were destroyed by fire such as Chicago, Cincinnati, San Francisco, and others, and the sons can not give the desired information as to dates, witness, etc., as required by those different States, which would also be eliminated with these bills.

I trust that your effort on behalf of your bills will meet with success, and that you will be able to convince those who have these matters in charge of the justness of your bills, and again offering you my apologies for intruding upon your most valuable time, I remain,

Very truly, yours,

A. J. HAAS, *Clerk*.

Now, I have taken a great deal of time and I thank you for your courtesy. I leave this matter in your hands, having called attention to a condition which actually exists which, in my judgment, should receive some action at the hands of this committee. I thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will take this matter up and look into it.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I asked the representatives of the War and Navy departments and the Marine Corps and Mr. Campbell to be here. I do not know about the order of precedence, but I think the committee would be glad to hear these gentlemen briefly.

STATEMENT OF BRIG. GEN. GEORGE B. DAVIS, JUDGE-ADVOCATE-GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY.

General DAVIS. Some time during the civil war, or shortly after its close, if I remember correctly, the present legislation facilitating to some extent the naturalization of a discharged soldier was enacted. This legislation was enacted, I think, with regard to the services of the volunteers rather than out of any consideration for the persons who might subsequently enlist in the Army or Navy or Marine Corps, for at that time there was no restriction in point of citizenship, nor was there until, I think, 1894 (sec. 2, act of Aug. 1, 1894; 28 Stat. L., 216), when it was provided for the first time that no person could enlist for the first time who was not a citizen of the United States or who had not signified his intention to become such. During the short period of the war with Spain that requirement was suspended, but it became operative again at its close.

Mr. BURNETT. By law, General?

General DAVIS. By law; one of the statutes that authorized the raising of volunteer forces. (Sec. 12, act of Mar. 2, 1899; 30 Stat. L., 979.)

Mr. BURNETT. Not by executive order?

General DAVIS. No; by statute. We would not presume to trespass upon the field of legislation.

Mr. BURNETT. In matters of necessity at that time I did not know what the practice would be.

General DAVIS. Certainly. So, as the matter now stands, an alien can not enlist unless he has received a certificate of naturalization or has signified his intention to become a citizen. Coupled with that is the requirement that he must also be able to read, write, and speak the English language as a condition precedent to enlistment. The result is that most of the recruits in the army who are of foreign birth—and the number of them is rather small—have been in the United States upon an average of from a year and a half to two years before they enlist at all, so as to enable them to acquire a knowledge of English and to make that preliminary declaration. They go on and serve, some of them, one enlistment of three years; some of them enough to make thirty years of service. They are ambulatory; they have no fixed residence; that is to say, one enlists in Maine and is discharged in San Francisco. If he intends to leave the service he wants to settle somewhere in San Francisco or in the West. In a great many cases they desire to settle at places very distant from their places of nativity. To execute the existing statute, which is embodied in section 2166, gives them great trouble. It makes it practically impossible for them to become citizens in the operation of that statute on account of the conditions of residence that have to be proved. All these men have served for three years under the close observation of officers of the army and navy.

It is not an easy thing to get an honorable discharge. It means in the army that the service rendered during that three years' period must have been honest and faithful, so that an honorable discharge means a great deal. It means that the soldier has been under the constant observation of officers for three years. It means that he has been trained in a great many things and has established a high character as a soldier. It would greatly relieve that class if some legal account could be taken of that three years' period of trial, terminated by an honorable discharge, and taking also into account the fact that they have been in this country a year and a half or two years before they enlist at all; in this way the five-year period is substantially covered, and if the condition precedent to naturalization could be restricted to the honorable discharge, it would greatly relieve a very considerable number of men in the Army and Navy and Marine Corps who have served faithfully one enlistment under the observation of the officers, have received honorable discharges, and desire by the act of becoming naturalized to become a part of the political community in which they have established themselves.

Mr. BURNETT. Now, they have already filed an application before they enlisted?

General DAVIS. They must have done that, and they must be able to read, write, and speak English.

Mr. BURNETT. The purpose of that would be, then, merely to consummate the original purpose as manifested by that declaration?

General DAVIS. Yes, sir. Something like this might be adopted as the closing clause: "Any alien of the age of 21 years and upward." I should say there is no question of children here: that does not appear. They must be single men to enlist. A relatively small

number of enlisted men may be married, noncommissioned officers of the higher grades, men belonging to the Hospital Corps, for whom quarters are provided, and the question is not so material with them; but the ordinary soldier must be unmarried. So there is no question of children here or of the naturalization of children, but only of giving a certain weight to the character that the soldier has established under three years' close observation by his officers and the evidence of that character as given in his honorable discharge [reading]:

Any alien of the age of 21 years and upward who has enlisted or may hereafter enlist in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, or in the volunteer forces, and has been or may hereafter be honorably discharged, shall be admitted to become a citizen of the United States upon his petition, and shall not be required to prove residence within the United States previous to his application to become such citizen, and the court admitting such alien shall be satisfied in respect to the moral character of the applicant by competent proof of such person having been honorably discharged from the military or the naval service of the United States at the expiration of a legal term of enlistment.

Mr. HAYES. Now, General, is this the proposed statute?

General DAVIS. That is the proposed modification.

Mr. HAYES. That is what I thought. The existing law does not go that far.

Mr. BURNETT. Is that Mr. Howland's bill?

General DAVIS. No; this is one I drew a good while ago, but it is merely a suggestion.

Mr. BURNETT. I see. I did not understand this.

Mr. SABATH. Is there a large number of aliens now in the army or navy, or is there only a small number?

General DAVIS. In the army the great majority are now native-born citizens. The number of aliens is not very great.

Mr. SABATH. How was it during the Spanish-American war?

General DAVIS. That clause was inserted as a measure of precaution, it not being known whether voluntary enlistments would be numerous or not, and it was thought to be wise to suspend that requirement during the period of the Spanish war. It made very little difference in the Regular Army. The same class of people enlisted there.

Mr. SABATH. Could you approximately give about the percentage of aliens in the army?

General DAVIS. It would be safer for the Adjutant-General to give it. If you wish, I will ask him to have it prepared for you.

Mr. SABATH. He has the records?

General DAVIS. He has records for each enlistment. They must show affirmatively that the applicant has conformed to the conditions, either submitted a certificate of naturalization or evidence of his preliminary oath.

Mr. BURNETT. That would be continued in here how long; before he can file his application or his declaration of intention he must remain here how long?

General DAVIS. At any time, but within two years of the close of the five-year period.

Mr. BURNETT. Now, then, you do not allow them to come in until how long after they have filed their declaration—immediately?

General DAVIS. Immediately. An alien comes here, gets work, and passes from one thing to another, but finally concludes he wants

to enlist, and if he has taken out his preliminary papers he produces them; if he has not, he is required to obtain them.

Mr. BURNETT. Then he has to be in the army three years before he can get an honorable discharge?

General DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURNETT. The law absolutely enforces that: there are none except those who present those declarations who are allowed to enlist?

General DAVIS. The enlistment is unlawful otherwise.

Mr. BURNETT. Then he is bound to have been here three years?

General DAVIS. Yes, sir, and as nearly as I can estimate, he must have been in the country between four and a half and five years.

Mr. HAYES. A discharge for disability before the term of enlistment has expired is not accounted an honorable discharge?

General DAVIS. It is an honorable discharge, but I made no mention of it in that draft. Those cases are not very frequent, but the thing that has brought it to the attention of the department is the correspondence from most excellent soldiers who have served their time faithfully, have saved up a little money, and want to establish themselves as members of a political community somewhere. They do not know anybody; they can not produce anybody who can testify as to what they have been doing. The certificate of honorable discharge is evidence of three years' residence under constant observation of people competent to observe the moral character of the soldier or sailor, and it would relieve that hardship and enable them to identify themselves with a community. That desire is very strong.

Mr. BURNETT. Let me ask you there, you say that they are discharged on account of disability sometimes?

General DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURNETT. Under the broad terms of this bill, even if a man serves six months and is honorably discharged on account of some disability, this bill would apply to him, would it not?

General DAVIS. No, sir; he must be in at least three years. In the navy it is four years, I think.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Could it not be so changed as to apply also to this? It seems to me wrong.

Mr. JOHNSON. Under this it would go on the same length of time.

General DAVIS. There are a number of discharges given before the expiration of the term of service to a man to whom that form of relief from the operation of his enlistment should be afforded. The men who ask us to do something to help them are men who have served, in a majority of cases, eight or nine years. They have served long enough to save up a thousand or fifteen hundred dollars in the army or navy, and they want to establish themselves somewhere. Now, a man may procure his discharge on account of dependency of a parent after a year. A man enlists, looks forward to the condition of his parents, and he says to himself, "I can not enlist unless my parents can look out for themselves," and after satisfying himself that they are provided for, or that he can provide for them, then he enlists. Now, one of them may die. So the law authorizes, after a year, if there has been a change in the conditions of dependency, that he can be discharged. That would be after a year's service. He may purchase his discharge at any time in the discretion of the Secretary of War. He may be discharged for disability. But it did

not seem necessary to meet those cases where they had served only a part of one enlistment. If one comes in and buys his way out, or goes out to support his parents, the chances are that that man's parents are American citizens. The cases that come to us for discharge are, in a majority of cases, where the male head of the family has died and left a widow with considerable property on her hands to look after and no other children than the soldier.

Mr. BURNETT. General, why should this be extended to apply to the children? Suppose the child of this foreigner had never been to this country?

General DAVIS. To whom?

Mr. BURNETT. To the children of these people.

General DAVIS. We have no concern with the children of these people.

Mr. BURNETT. That is the bill of Mr. Howland that is under consideration. What would be your recommendation with regard to that?

General DAVIS. They could have no children while they were connected with the United States as enlisted men.

Mr. BURNETT. You never enlist anyone except single men?

General DAVIS. That is the rule. If a married man is enlisted it requires the permission of the Adjutant-General. It is only given in very exceptional circumstances.

Mr. BURNETT. Then in those cases do you think a child that has never been to this country ought to be permitted to come right over and be naturalized within a short time?

Mr. BENNET. How could a man serving in the Army of the United States have such a child? His wife would have to take a special trip over in order to have the child over there.

Mr. HAYES. She might have been over all the time.

Mr. BENNET. Then that would not be his child.

Mr. SABATH. But there are cases where married men do enlist?

General DAVIS. A very limited number.

Mr. SABATH. From time to time I have requests from wives of men who have enlisted, asking me to secure a release of the husband.

General DAVIS. They were married, perhaps, after they enlisted.

Mr. SABATH. No. I have had a great many cases—not a great many, but I know myself of at least a half a dozen or a dozen cases in my own district—where a young man would marry, and on account of a little trouble at home or on account of not being able to secure work, especially in 1907, a good many of them enlisted, and after they had been in for a few months the wives would come to me and ask if I could in any way assist in securing their release.

General DAVIS. Those men all swore that they were single. Those little tragedies will happen.

Mr. BURNETT. Like a lot of minors that would swear they were of age. I will tell you, I believe that the burden ought to be placed on the War Department to ascertain whether they are minors before they are taken.

General DAVIS. Certainly.

Mr. BURNETT. We have been trying to get that through, but it has been fought by the Military Committee all the time.

Mr. BENNET. I would like to ask the General just one question. Mr. Campbell called my attention to the fact that your suggested bill

does not touch one thing. Under the naturalization law a man, in order to be naturalized, has to be one year continuously within the jurisdiction of the court.

General DAVIS. That is a thing that works the greatest hardship to discharged soldiers and sailors. Their residence is constrained, you know. Suppose one is serving in San Francisco Harbor; he may serve there three years, but that is not a residence that he can prove.

Mr. BURNETT. But the residence is presumed to be where he filed his declaration.

Mr. SABATH. He would have to produce two witnesses to swear that he has resided in that district there for at least three years, or five years, and where can such soldier or sailor obtain such witnesses or prove his residence?

Mr. HAYES. What particular hardship would it be to a soldier or sailor to settle down and live for a year in a community before he applied for naturalization, any more than it would be for anybody else?

General DAVIS. It would not be a hardship if he did not have to go to a distant jurisdiction.

Mr. BENNET. He has to get witnesses who have known him five years.

Mr. HAYES. I think not, though; this is existing law here.

Mr. BENNET. Under the naturalization statute.

Mr. HAYES. This is an exception.

Mr. BURNETT. The naturalization statute did not amend this old law.

Mr. SABATH. Still, all the judges insist that you bring your witnesses who have known your applicant five years.

Mr. HAYES. Not if they have been honorably discharged, because they are excepted in the law. He has to prove only one year.

Mr. SABATH. I do not know about that.

General DAVIS. If a clause were inserted requiring one year's residence at the place where he proposes to establish himself, that would diminish the hardship very greatly.

Mr. HAYES. I think that is the existing law, is it not?

General DAVIS. I do not remember. The point is that it is very difficult to apply this civil-war statute to the ambulatory cases of enlisted men in the army and navy, who enlist in Maine and are discharged in San Francisco, and so find it impossible to comply with that statute.

Mr. BURNETT. General, of course the main purpose of those naturalization laws and those requirements is to give them a probationary period within which to prepare themselves for citizenship. Now, then, do you think that a man who came over here, filed his declaration, and at once enlisted in the army and was in that ambulatory condition, perhaps went to the Philippines at once, or to Cuba, or somewhere else, would be a fit subject for citizenship without having some residence here?

General DAVIS. I think so, with that training. He is obliged to go to school. There may be occasional periods of very active operations when he can not go to school, but the law requires that they be taught the rudimentary branches and the history of the United States, and those schools are maintained, and the instruction in citizenship, I should say, which they receive in the course of a three-year enlistment,

is at least as great in amount as he would acquire in the ordinary civil community.

Mr. BURNETT. You mean your army schools?

General DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURNETT. Leavenworth, and schools of that character?

General DAVIS. The schools that are maintained at every post. The enlisted men are required to be taught.

Mr. JOHNSON. General, would he not acquire more information and more knowledge about our Government in that way than he would in the ordinary community?

General DAVIS. Yes; because he is a part of the military arm. For instance, the regiments that went to Cuba during the intervention to establish a stable government there watched the development of affairs from day to day. So it is in the Philippine Islands. So it was in Porto Rico. They are practically part of the Government, they are engaged in the operations of the Government, to a very considerable extent.

Mr. BURNETT. Not the civil part of it so much, however.

General DAVIS. But they are told constantly that the civil power is supreme in this country. When one of them goes to town and gets a drink or two too many, and, coming from abroad, wants the post commander to send over a detachment to take him away forcibly, he is told that is not done in this country; that in this country the civil power is supreme, that the army is subordinate to it. I do not know when an enlisted man or a noncommissioned officer who was put in a position that required him to use judgment in the execution of his duties in that regard in our insular possessions or elsewhere has failed in his trust. They are very conservative constitutional lawyers.

The CHAIRMAN. General, we are very much obliged to you for appearing before the committee. The information you gave was very interesting.

STATEMENT OF LIEUT. COMMANDER H. A. WILEY, OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY.

Mr. BENNET. Now, Commander Wiley, will you please give us any observations you may desire?

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. I suppose, sir, that you desire me to follow about the same lines as General Davis, so far as applies to the navy?

Mr. BENNET. Except that if your views are the same as his, it may not be necessary for a repetition.

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. I mean you want me to give my views along those lines?

Mr. BENNET. Yes.

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. What we desire is a modification of the act. It at present requires five consecutive years' service in the navy and a full enlistment in the Marine Corps, and we think that ought to be changed to apply to the navy, a full enlistment in the navy and also four years' service in the naval auxiliary service, which is a part of the navy at the present time—that means colliers and hospital ships and other vessels manned by civilian crews—and to remove this restriction which requires ninety days'

residence previous to the final action of a court on an application for naturalization. When this bill was finally made a law the period of enlistment in the Marine Corps was five years, was it not, Colonel Lauchheimer?

Colonel LAUCHHEIMER. Yes.

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. The period of enlistment in the navy was three years. In order to make the same service necessary in both branches the law was made to read that way—a full enlistment in the Marine Corps or five consecutive years' service in the navy. Since then the enlistment in the Marine Corps has been reduced.

Mr. BURNETT. To what?

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. To four years, and the period of enlistment in the navy has been increased to four years, and the five years requirement there now, of course, takes a man over into his second enlistment after he has received an honorable discharge from his first period of service, and it is very difficult sometimes for a man to be at the place where he had filed his petition, you know, previous to final action, especially in the navy, because he might be in any part of the world. It is impossible for us to keep track of the cases of aliens in order that we may be able to place them in the jurisdiction of any particular courts. If that period were made four years and the restriction requiring that he should be ninety days within the jurisdiction of any particular court and that he should bring proof of good moral character by witnesses resident in that district were abolished, that is all we would ask.

Mr. HAYES. Would it not be more desirable to make the period the same in all branches of the service? The law now requires three years, as I remember it, for the soldier. Why not make it the same for the sailor and the Marine Corps? It seems to me that would be equitable.

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. Yes; that would be desirable.

Mr. BURNETT. For uniformity, at least.

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. I was only speaking for the navy.

Mr. HAYES. You see no objection to that, do you?

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. No. In fact, that applies to merchant sailors now. I do not know exactly why it is, but the restrictions on merchant sailors are very limited. They can become citizens of the United States simply by serving three years honorably as merchant sailors; there is no other requirement at all.

Mr. BURNETT. Is that by law or a custom?

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. By law—1875.

Mr. JOHNSON. And a man who serves in the army honorably and sincerely and bravely can not?

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. No, sir; I do not think so.

Mr. BENNET. He has to prove a year's residence in the United States.

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. No matter if he serves five years—the law requires five consecutive years in the navy.

Mr. BURNETT. Do you have the same requirement that the judge-advocate spoke of in regard to their having to present their declaration before they can enlist in the navy and marine service?

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. No, sir; but we do not enlist aliens except for the insular forces, which means Filipinos. We carry 500 Filipinos, as a maximum, as an insular force; but while the law does not forbid the enlistment of aliens, we do not enlist aliens.

Mr. BURNETT. You enlist men who are foreign born, of course, very frequently?

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. People who have been in the service previously we reenlist.

Mr. BURNETT. You do not now enlist any man foreign born if he has filed a declaration?

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. If he is an alien we do not.

Mr. BURNETT. If he has filed his declaration of becoming a citizen, do you enlist him?

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. That fact has no bearing.

Mr. BURNETT. Suppose he has perfected his naturalization?

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. Then he is a citizen.

Mr. BURNETT. He must have perfected his naturalization, then, before you enlist him?

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. Yes, sir; but there is no law which requires us to pursue that course; that is an executive order. Of course, at the present time we have in the navy, to be absolutely accurate, about 1,890 aliens. That includes, of course, the insular force.

Mr. BENNET. What is your total strength?

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. Last year, when this list was made, 44,290, and only a little over 4 per cent were aliens.

Mr. JOHNSON. Four per cent aliens?

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURNETT. And most of those are in the insular force?

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. No; the maximum in the insular force is 500. So you see there are a good many others who are not in the insular force, about 1,250 or 1,300.

Mr. BURNETT. They are old enlistments, though, are they?

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. Reenlistments; yes, sir.

Mr. BURNETT. There are no new enlistments, then, except those in the insular force?

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. Absolutely none.

Mr. BURNETT. This bill of Mr. Howland's contemplates allowing the children to come in. What is your view in regard to that?

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. Of course, that might have a bearing which I do not understand; I am only speaking from a limited interest. We do not ask for that. We ask for nothing as regards the children of aliens. We only ask that they be permitted to become citizens without unnecessary annoyance. That is all. It is very difficult for them to become citizens now.

Mr. BENNET. Commander, is there not a regulation in the navy, or a statute—I do not know which—that a sailor can not get a promotion until he becomes a citizen?

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. No; he can get a promotion, Mr. Bennett, but it deprives him of certain emoluments and certain standing. He could not get what we call a permanent appointment as a petty officer.

Mr. BURNETT. He can not enlist now, as I understand?

Mr. BENNET. No; but an alien who is in the service can not get a permanent appointment as a petty officer.

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. A man who reenlists in the navy after his first period of honorable service and discharge is entitled to \$5 additional pay; but if he is not a citizen of the United States he is not entitled to that \$5; he is excluded from that benefit. Whenever a man is made a petty officer in the navy, which corresponds to a noncommissioned officer in the Army and Marine Corps, he gets an appointment on paper which he holds for a period of a year as a probationary office. At the end of the year, if he is recommended for it, he may be issued a permanent appointment, and that is on parchment, something in the form of a diploma from a school. That carries with it this benefit, that he can not be deprived of it except by sentence of a court-martial. His commanding officer, even though he has been promoted by his recommendation, can not reduce him except by sentence of a court-martial. A man holding an acting appointment can be deprived of that appointment and sent back to his previous rating simply by the order of the commanding officer. You see that is a protection to a man, of course, and an alien can not enjoy that privilege. He can get his advancement, but he can not get the protection that others get by a permanent appointment, and not being able to get a permanent appointment he can never become a warrant officer in the navy, which is another great hardship, because we have some most excellent men who otherwise would make fine warrant officers, but they are not eligible to be examined for the position.

Mr. BURNETT. Is that by law or by executive order?

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. That is departmental regulation, sir; not law or executive order either.

Mr. SABATH. I would like to ask you a question. You do not find the same hardship in securing enlisted men for the navy as they do in the army, do you. You are not obliged to advertise and spend as much money to secure them?

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. We spend a good deal, sir. It is difficult to keep the complement up under present conditions because every young man who presents himself for enlistment is required to present a birth certificate, or affidavits setting forth his age, unless it is plainly evident that he is over 21 years of age, and although we can enlist them as young as 17 years, with the consent of parents, if a young man is less than 21 years old he must present this evidence.

Mr. BURNETT. A birth certificate from the parent?

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. Either from the parent or guardian or the record.

Mr. BENNET. We amended that law last year.

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. In the appropriation bill it read something like this, that "No part of this appropriation"—that is, the naval appropriation bill, pay of navy—"shall be available unless"—the essence of it was unless a certificate is required of all minors. Of course we are not tying up the appropriation for anything of that kind.

Mr. SABATH. That is, if it appears they are minors, but if they swear they are 21 years of age?

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. It is not accepted. The recruiting officer is subject to court-martial if he accepts any such evidence.

Mr. JOHNSON. It is a question of absolute proof, a court record or an affidavit?

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. If there is no question—if I went to a recruiting officer he would not hesitate to accept me as 21 years or over. But if it is not perfectly evident on the face of it that a man is 21 years of age he must produce a birth certificate or affidavit setting forth his age. In other words, the conscience of the recruiting officer is not elastic at all; he is not permitted to have an elastic conscience.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Is that the rule now for enlistment in the navy, that a man must be 21 years of age?

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. He is not required to be 21 years of age.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. But does the law now require the production of a birth certificate?

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. Yes, sir; either a birth certificate or documentary evidence in the form of affidavits from the parents or other evidence which leaves no doubt of the man's age. Sometimes he can secure the evidence when he can not secure the birth certificate.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Is it not a fact that a number of applications have been made from time to time for the discharge of enlisted men on the ground that they were under the age and had not the parents' consent, and that a birth certificate had not been produced at the time of enlistment?

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. He would have had the birth certificate or the consent.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Not that, but a great many applications are made from time to time for the discharge of young men who had enlisted when under age and had not produced birth certificates or any other proof than their own affidavits.

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. That is true, in a way.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. It is true?

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. It is true only to a limited degree. It is true that they had not produced birth certificates, but had produced in every case evidence which had been accepted.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Their own affidavits.

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. Not an affidavit of the man himself, but somebody purporting to be his parent or his guardian. Those cases seem to be very frequent, sir, but as a percentage they are very small, and it has been shown in every case that perjury had been committed. But the recruiting officer has, in every case, attempted to discover the truth before enlistment was made.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Would you have the kindness to give us that bill? We have only four minutes more time. We would like to hear the bill you have prepared.

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. Yes, sir. This was the draft of a bill that was prepared by the department, and I went over it very carefully at the time. It reads as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any alien of the age of twenty-one years and upward who has served or may hereafter so serve for one enlistment of four years in the United States Navy or Marine Corps, and receives an honorable discharge, or an ordinary discharge with recommendation for reenlistment—

I would like to explain what that means. It is simply this, that

there are two forms of honorable discharge in the navy. One is what we call an honorable discharge, which entitles a man to a gratuity of four months pay if he reenlists within four months. The other is called an ordinary discharge, and does not carry with it that gratuity. But it means that his service is perfectly honorable [continuing reading]—

or who has completed four years of honorable service in the naval auxiliary service—

Those are the vessels I spoke of a moment ago as being manned by a civilian crew—

shall be admitted to become a citizen of the United States upon his petition without any previous declaration of his intention to become such, and without proof of residence on shore—

The courts have held, I believe, that it is not necessary for him to prove his residence on shore if he has spent his time on a United States vessel, and the same should apply to the Marine Corps—

and the court admitting such alien shall, in addition to proof of good moral character, be satisfied by competent proof from naval sources of such service—

That is really a repetition of the old bill in that particular paragraph—

Provided,—

And this, of course, is the essence of the change—

That an honorable discharge from the Navy, Marine Corps, the naval auxiliary service, or an ordinary discharge with a recommendation for reenlistment shall be accepted as proof of good moral character.

It is pretty hard for a man, you know, to produce proof of good moral character by residents. In nine cases out of ten, if produced, it is worthless or purchased, because men who do not have homes can not produce it from residents who know them.

Mr. BURNETT. He can prove it by his comrades.

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. It is difficult sometimes to get them.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Is there any limit fixed in the proposed measure between the time of making the application for naturalization and the time when the discharge is granted? I want to make myself plain. For instance, if there was an honorable discharge granted, say, in 1910, and then no application made for naturalization until 1915, there would be a lapse of five years. Yet the court would not have before it any evidence of the good character of those five years and would be bound under this bill to accept the certificate of honorable discharge as absolute proof of this man's good character at the time of the application for naturalization. Do you think that ought to be cured in the present bill?

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. I had not seen that point..

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. You see the point now, do you?

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON. But the discharge itself is practically a judicial finding.

Mr. BURNETT. At that time.

Mr. JOHNSON. That all those years he has been in the navy he has conducted himself honorably.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Yes, but during five years, in the case instanced, there would be no evidence that he had conducted himself at all,

and there might be acts which would not entitle him, in the judgment of good, honorable citizens, to citizenship.

Mr. JOHNSON. After he comes out of the navy that would be brought to show his character under enlistment.

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. I think the point is very well taken, and I think that there would be no objection to putting that sort of a proviso in.

Mr. GOLDSFOGLE. Since you are so familiar with the subject, I would ask you whether offhand you could suggest a proviso that you think ought to be added?

Lieutenant-Commander WILEY. You might say one who reenlists within four months.

Mr. BENNET. Perhaps Colonel Lauchheimer would like to say a few words to us before we leave.

Col. CHARLES H. LAUCHHEIMER. I would like to say on behalf of the Marine Corps that the comments made by General Davis and Lieutenant-Commander Wiley apply with equal force to the Marine Corps. It is just a question of modifying section 2166, and the draft of the bill which Lieutenant-Commander Wiley has presented to you gentlemen fully covers the entire question so far as the Marine Corps is concerned.

Mr. BENNET. So you do not desire to attend any further meetings we may have?

Colonel LAUCHHEIMER. I would be very happy to be here.

Mr. BURNETT. You have no suggestion to make in regard to the Howland bill taking in the children?

Colonel LAUCHHEIMER. That is a matter to which I have given absolutely no consideration, and, as General Davis said, we do not enlist men who are married. Some subsequently do get married.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very much obliged to you gentlemen for the information you have given us.

(Thereupon, at 12 o'clock noon, the committee adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, January 21, 1910, at 10.30 o'clock a. m.)

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Friday, January 21, 1910.

The committee met at 10.30 o'clock a. m., Hon. Benjamin F. Howell (chairman) presiding. Others present were Representatives Bennet, Burnett, Elvins, Hayes, Johnson, Moore of Texas, Küstermann, and Sabath.

STATEMENT OF MR. RICHARD K. CAMPBELL, CHIEF, DIVISION OF NATURALIZATION, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Campbell, would you like to make a statement in regard to bill 14576?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am not prepared to make any statement; if the members of the committee desire to ask me any questions I shall be glad to answer them.

Mr. BENNET. Well, we will ask the general question: What is your opinion of bills 14574, 14575, and 14576?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Those are the three bills that Mr. Howland took up yesterday?

Mr. BENNET. Yes, sir.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, it seems to me that the real difficulty in the way of carrying out Mr. Howland's plan might be very readily removed, by simply exempting people of that description from filing a declaration of intention; they can surely wait the ninety days after filing a petition under such a law, and allow the examiners to find out whether they are men of good moral character; in other respects—their knowledge of English, their knowledge of our institutions, and their residence here—they are entitled to be naturalized immediately. The point he made yesterday was that these sons of veterans, who had voted, would be compelled, in order to become citizens, to file a declaration and wait for two years; now, by exempting them from filing a declaration, they can file their petition at once. I think I am on record as advocating the abolition of the declaration anyhow; I certainly do not see any fault that would flow from it in this case, because their fitness would be passed on by a court, after an examination and report to that court had been made. So far as the other points are concerned, I can see no objection to them, if the Government reserves its right to make an investigation and have the court pass upon the qualifications of persons in each instance. I do not think it would put them to any serious disadvantage.

Mr. BENNET. What did you think of the opinion of General Davis and Commander Wiley, that a discharge ought to be at least proof of good character for the time it covered?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think it is even better proof than the proof we have to rely on generally; there is no question about it. A subordinate of an officer in the military or naval service of the United States is subject to much more continuous and close observation than a man in civil life is from his neighbors, and a discharge ought to be a sufficient verification of his character, qualifications and duration of residence. It seems to me that in cases of that sort the purposes of the law would be accomplished by abolishing, as far as such petitioners are concerned, the one year residence within a State.

Mr. BENNET. If within the jurisdiction of the court?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, sir. And as to the ninety days' delay after filing a petition, those delays are for the purpose of securing evidence as to the man's character, and if it can be accomplished through these other means, certainly there is no use in delaying the matter just for the sake of uniformity, especially in view of the fact that it does occasion very serious hardship. I have known of repeated instances of such hardship in the cases of seamen. I recalled yesterday, in connection with the suggestion made by Mr. Bennet, a case of a seaman who filed his petition in San Francisco, and before it could be heard, that is, before the expiration of the ninety days after filing, he was sent to Washington. He came into my office and said he had filed a petition there and that two days afterwards he was ordered away; and he stated to me that the reason for being very anxious to get it now was that he was entitled to a promotion and that he could not get it until he became naturalized. To be sure, that class, in view of what was said yesterday, is one that is limited in number, and if the present policy is persisted in the supply will soon be exhausted; but there is

no assurance that the present policy will be persisted in, unless Congress passes some law forbidding the employment of aliens in the military and naval services. If a man comes into the United States to-day and he files a declaration of intention, without any conditions attached to it of any sort, it is received as a matter of course; the only case in which there is ever any delay is where a clerk is bold enough to assume that he is not a "white person," but that does not occur very often.

Mr. HAYES. Don't you think there might be danger in abolishing the ninety days' interval between the filing of the petition and the hearing in this: Perhaps there would not be any danger in having these honorable discharges counterfeited, but they might pass from hand to hand and men be naturalized who are not entitled to it at all.

Mr. CAMPBELL. They would subject themselves to a very severe penalty. Still, there is something in that suggestion. I merely make that as a suggestion, so far as it is a reason for investigation; you know within a few days that matter could be investigated. Still, ninety days is a very small matter; I only added that. The one-year interval ought to be abolished and the ninety days, if possible, in view of the concrete illustration which I cited.

Mr. BENNET. Couldn't a law be drafted containing these different provisions—first, abolishing the declaration of intention as to people mentioned in Mr. Howland's bill; second, providing that an honorable discharge should be proof of good moral character during the time it covered?

Mr. CAMPBELL. And of residence?

Mr. BENNET. Yes, and of residence; and that where a man desired to be naturalized while still remaining in the service that that should be done by proof by his commanding officer that he was still in the service.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That would accomplish it.

Mr. BENNET. The one year and the ninety days could both be abolished.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Exactly; that would accomplish the purpose admirably.

Mr. HAYES. I doubt whether it would be safe to abolish the ninety days.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have been thinking of it. My statement was made in view of the general position I have held, that these exemptions are made anyhow to men who are actually engaged in the service, and I do not think there is any great hardship on a man who has left the service to wait his time.

Mr. BENNET. But his honorable discharge ought to be proof of residence and good character for the time it covers?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Precisely; just as conclusive as the proof of the two witnesses.

Mr. BENNET. It is better.

Mr. BURNETT. Then if he did not apply at once it shall not be further evidence as to any time except that embraced in his term of service?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes; that is the idea exactly. While we are on the subject of those exemptions, I would like to ask the committee if it does not think it would be a wise plan to draw a general bill covering all classes of service in the United States Government, either civil or

military, such service as puts applicants in a position which makes it impossible for them to comply with the requirements as to residence, and permit the Government to secure from a man's superior officer a statement that would be equivalent to an honorable discharge issued by the military and naval authorities. We have the Coast and Geodetic Survey; they have such persons in their employ. The chief of that service called regarding the hardship on the employees in his service of requiring strict compliance, as to residence, with the law. Of course, as I said to him, that would be with reference merely to people who had been engaged heretofore, because I believe at the present time an applicant for appointment under the classified civil service rules must be an American citizen. But they have had men, I know, foreigners, who desire to become naturalized, and the vessels on which they are occupied are constantly away at irregular times, so they can not specify any particular dates.

Mr. HAYES. You think this same exemption should apply to them?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, sir. I think it would be well to repeal those sections, beginning with section 2166 and ending with the act of 1894, and try to cover all those classes in the bill, because it will remove a great deal of doubt, some of the courts holding now that a petitioner under sections 2166 or 2174 under no condition has to comply with any requirements of the act of 1906, although he files his petition under that act.

Mr. BENNET. I make a motion that the Secretary of Commerce and Labor be requested to have drafted for the committee a bill remodeling the statutes that are not embraced in the naturalization law of 1906 covering these points: Waiving the declaration of intention as to the parties mentioned in Mr. Howland's bills; providing that an honorable discharge of a soldier, sailor, marine, as well as the auxiliary force of the nation, shall be evidence of both residence and good moral character for the time covered by the discharge, and that as to any persons of the classes mentioned who desire to be naturalized while still remaining in the service, upon affidavit from his commanding officer as to identity, good moral character, and facts of service, the provision as to one year's residence and ninety days' delay be waived, together with such other changes as he deems advisable.

Mr. SABATH. Why waive only as to those that still remain in the army and navy on the ninety days? Why not as to the others? If the others have served the country and have been in the army or navy for three or four years, they no doubt are honorably discharged and no doubt can prove that they are deserving to become citizens. Therefore why impose the additional restriction of ninety days? These ninety days, if I am not mistaken, are for the purpose of giving our investigators opportunity to investigate, notwithstanding the fact that the two witnesses have testified to the good character of the applicant—to give our investigators an opportunity of investigating and reporting. Now, then, if these men have been in the service for three or four years and have these honorable discharges, why should they be obliged to wait ninety days?

Mr. HAYES. There is no hardship placed upon those people.

Mr. SABATH. Well, there is this hardship: They are discharged and they——

Mr. HAYES. They are not in the service and have a place of residence.

Mr. SABATH. Well, these men, in many instances, I believe, will be induced to join the army in order to become citizens, frequently believing that that will aid them in a great measure, and they do not like, perhaps, to wait ninety days; I think it should not be necessary for them to wait ninety days if they have been in the service.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Goldfogle asked the question which brought it to our minds—what guarantee have we that a man who has served and has been honorably discharged has had a good moral character since he has been discharged?

Mr. SABATH. What guarantee have we if they have secured citizenship that they are not liable to do something in the future that may, perhaps, be considered a violation or offense or crime?

Mr. BENNET. We have adopted them; that is a different thing.

Mr. HAYES. The gentleman probably had in mind the thousands of frauds perpetrated upon this country by certificates of naturalization being brought here by foreigners from abroad. What would prevent the use of an honorable discharge of a soldier, especially if he happened to return to Europe, by scores of others to be naturalized?

Mr. SABATH. I myself have no knowledge of any fraud, only such fraud as I have heard of being perpetrated in the city of New York by the issuing of some few fraudulent naturalization papers.

Mr. HAYES. There are thousands of them in San Francisco.

Mr. SABATH. I know none have been committed in our city with the exception where a clerk, by reason of gross negligence, failed to register the names of applicants in the proper record.

Mr. JOHNSON. Could I make one suggestion? It occurs to me there ought to be proof of their identity so there may be no question.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is what the investigators do.

Mr. BURNETT. That is way the ninety days' interim is given?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURNETT. You are waiving it as to those who are still in the service, providing an affidavit is procured, according to Mr. Bennet's suggestion, from the commanding officer, that the applicant is still in the service and that he is the man to whom this honorable discharge relates? That can be secured in a very little while.

Mr. JOHNSON. When a man presents an affidavit that he is still in the service, that he has served so long, his discharge showing his term of service, and so on, should there not be some additional proof of his identity?

Mr. BENNET. That is furnished by his captain.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, after all, the court has to be satisfied, and most of the courts, particularly of late, are very careful about it. You see, if a man goes out, his residence has to be proved, not only his fitness, Mr. Sabath.

Mr. SABATH. I thought we had talked about that yesterday, that the limitation should be that he should make an application within a year after being—well, say six months after he has been discharged from the army.

Mr. JOHNSON. It has not been a hard matter to show his residence before and during that period of six months?

Mr. CAMPBELL. No, sir.

Mr. HAYES. He maintains a residence during those six months that he is out of the service.

Mr. SABATH. I may have more experience and knowledge of these matters than a majority of you gentlemen, because from my district, I venture to say, I have a larger number of young men that enlist than in any other district, perhaps, in the United States, and I know that these boys, after they get through, do not know just exactly where to settle; they may try a few weeks here and try to obtain a fair position and may not succeed, and they go somewhere else; if you do not offer them every opportunity, sometimes they secure a position where it is hard for them to go and secure papers; they go away out in the country, or go out in a place where they are obliged to spend several days in procuring such naturalization. Of course, if they stay in Chicago——

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Are those aliens that you are speaking of?

Mr. SABATH. Yes, sir; aliens.

Mr. BURNETT. Let me ask you a question. In the hearing yesterday it was stated that those who enlisted in the army had to file their declaration of intention before enlistment—I believe that was stated yesterday. Does that apply to the navy and army now?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not know the laws under which they enlist the men.

Mr. BENNET. It was stated that that did not apply.

Mr. BURNETT. Your suggestion is to abolish that requirement—the declaration before enlistment?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, sir. My suggestion, as a matter of fact, simply relates to that class of soldier or seaman who is delayed for two years after he has performed his military service in order to file his declaration, and he must wait the two years prescribed by the law before he can petition. Now, if he has, as a matter of fact, filed his declaration he can get it at once; that is, within ninety days; but if we abolish the ninety days by the first term of the court he can be naturalized.

Mr. BURNETT. Would not your suggestion, the effect of it, cause them to join the army without having filed any application at all?

Mr. CAMPBELL. The War Department, I think, makes its own conditions as to entering the service.

Mr. BENNET. The statute of 1894 prohibits anyone from enlisting unless they file a declaration.

Mr. BURNETT. Wouldn't your suggestion repeal that?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I don't think so. My suggestion refers to a class of people who enlisted when there was no such requirement, it seems men whose sons have reached the right age of 60 years, in some cases. It relates to those who served during the civil war. My suggestion was to call attention to the injustice of first having to file a declaration and then wait for two years; simply to abolish the declaration and let them file petitions immediately and submit to the other provisions of the law; that that would sufficiently protect us and at the same time give them the rights to which they had no claim before.

Mr. BENNET. That would affect all these inconsistencies in the naturalization laws and statutes?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAYES. Suppose we required, in all arms of the service, before any person shall be listed, that he shall declare his intention?

Mr. CAMPBELL. That would remove the trouble as to the future, but I understand Mr. Howland's bill is drafted to meet the situation

which now exists, in which he claims that great hardships are incurred by men who have practically lived all of their lives here and voted under the full impression that they were citizens. Now the registration officers are more careful, since the new law went into effect, and those persons are thrown out, and I think it is a great injustice and hardship.

Mr. BURNETT. Could not the State take up this matter and pass enabling legislation in this connection?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, we are not attempting to legislate them into the capacity to vote alone; there are other rights of citizenship. If you pass a bill of this sort they become citizens and besides acquiring this political privilege they will acquire many others; they will acquire the status of an American citizen for protection abroad, which is very important. We are all the time meeting with very pathetic cases of people who are denied protection abroad.

Mr. BURNETT. Denied protection by their own countries as well as our own?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAYES. If a State did undertake to sanction such a thing, the moment they left the State, they would again become aliens?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, sir. Mr. Howland's statement aroused my sympathy, because there are men, hundreds or thousands, in these States who were not denied the privilege of voting and are under the full conviction that they are American citizens; I know scores of such instances; and it is a very natural conclusion to reach. They have had certain privileges granted to them, the right to vote and so forth, and they say, "What more can I get if I am an American citizen?" Take the average man and he will not see that there is any more to get by paying \$2 for something additional; he says, "I have got all I want." But when an emergency comes, he finds that he has not all he must have. If the Government is going to take control of this question, and acknowledge that these people have some sort of equitable claim, they should go so far as to protect them in the enjoyment of these rights and have these rights clearly discriminated, so there can not be any error on their part, a very natural error, as to what they have got to do to become citizens.

Mr. BURNETT. Some of his bills go further than that. If a man comes here and enlists, whether a child has ever been here or not, after he has been discharged, his bills enable that child to become a citizen.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is another case.

Mr. BURNETT. I want to hear Mr. Campbell on those propositions; they do not strike me with much favor.

Mr. CAMPBELL. They do not strike me individually with any favor; I was never impressed with the justice of the provisions we now have in the law and which we have had there for many, many years, by which, if a man himself should become naturalized his children, whether qualified or not, were made citizens at the age of 21 years.

Mr. BENNET. Was not the law worse than it is now? That if a man took out a declaration of intention and died before perfecting his naturalization, his wife and children immediately became citizens?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, sir; on taking the oath of allegiance they immediately became such; now, they have to file a petition—and that is a partial concession to my view—and submit to all the provisions of law that were required of those having filed petitions.

Mr. HAYES. Don't you think we would be reasonably safe if we should adopt Mr. Howland's suggestion as to the past, and then for the future have a provision that before a man enlists he must file his declaration, and that if he has left the service he is subject——

Mr. SABATH. That is the law now.

Mr. HAYES. No; it does not exist in the army. (Continuing.) Subject to the provisions of the law now existing as to matter of residence.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I should think so, Mr. Hayes. But that is a question of policy to which I have never given any serious consideration.

Mr. HAYES. If you see any objections, will you kindly indicate them to the committee?

Mr. SABATH. A great many aliens served in the Spanish-American war, and, if I am not mistaken, the law was suspended during that time, and any alien was accepted in the army as well as in the navy. Is that not true?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am not prepared to say whether it is so or not; I think it might have been so under such an emergency.

Mr. SABATH. And there are a great many of these men who served during the Spanish-American war who are now not citizens; is that not true?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I really could not tell; I have not looked into the subject.

Mr. HAYES. There could not be a great many who served in the Spanish-American war.

Mr. SABATH. Oh, yes. How are they in the navy?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not know anything about the conditions. I do not know anything officially as to the conditions under which they enlist the men. A statement was made yesterday by Commander Wiley, I think, that they enlisted nobody that could not produce evidence of citizenship, but that they reenlisted those who had been enlisted prior to 1899.

Mr. BURNETT. In the few cases he mentioned there were some exceptions.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes; but I have never gone into that detail at all; I have no knowledge on the subject.

Mr. BURNETT. I think Mr. Bennet's motion is a correct one.

(Mr. Bennet's motion was thereupon agreed to.)

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Tuesday, January 25, 1910.

The committee met at 10.30 o'clock a. m., Hon. Benjamin F. Howell (chairman) presiding. Others present were Representatives Bennett, Burnet, Elvins, Goldfogle, Hayes, Küstermann, and Sabbath.

STATEMENT OF MR. JAMES H. PATTEN.

Mr. HAYES. I would like to have Mr. Patten heard by the committee, if there is no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, there is no objection.

Mr. HAYES. I would like, Mr. Patten, to have you discuss first the matter of the increase in the head tax which this bill provides, bill H. R. No. 13404.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee: It seems to me that phrase "head tax" is a misnomer, as it does not accurately characterize the nature of the tax. In the first act levying it, that of August 3, 1882, it was called a "duty," and perhaps then was, as characterized in the marginal caption, a "head tax," and may have been, as claimed by the steamships, added to the passage money by the transportation companies. But under existing law and conditions the sum of \$4 is "levied on" and "collected from" the steamship companies for every alien brought to this country.

My point is that the words "head tax" do not accurately characterize the nature of the levy collection and its incidence, for the reasons that the immigrant to-day as a rule knows nothing of the tax, and in my opinion, and in the opinion of most students of the question, does not pay it in the sense that steerage rates are increased solely because of it or would be proportionately less were it decreased. The present tax of \$4 does not seem to be shifted by the steamship companies to the immigrant, but seems to come out of their profits. The steamship companies have formed a gentlemen's agreement and divided up the foreign territory from which immigrants come into three spheres. They have an agreement, for instance, for fixing steerage rates, according to the testimony of Gustav H. Schwab of the North German Lloyd, who appeared before the industrial commission in 1899. During the latter seventies and early eighties the steerage passenger rate fluctuated from as low as \$12 up as high as \$25, but averaged about \$17 or \$18, I believe. In the latter eighties and early nineties, as testified to by Mr. Schwab and others before the industrial commission (Vol. XV), most of the foreign steamship companies—there were no native companies—gradually increased the steerage rates to about \$38 or \$39, varying with the port, size of vessel, and conveniences. Steamships not in the agreement or pool abided by the rates fixed. That state of facts, which is testified to by the representatives of the steamship companies, shows that they fix steerage rates on the principle of monopoly price—that is, they fix the rate where they think it will bring them the greatest aggregate profit for the traffic—they "charge the traffic all it will bear."

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Wouldn't they make it lower if they didn't have to pay this \$4?

Mr. PATTEN. I do not believe they would, for the reason that present rates prevailed in 1899, when the tax was only \$1, and does not seem to have been increased in 1903, when the tax was doubled, nor in 1907, when it was again doubled; and, on the other hand, when this so-called "head tax" (but which I should prefer to follow a distinguished member of this committee (Mr. Gardner) in calling a "per capita steamship tax," or "steamship per capita tax") was last doubled—that is, increased from \$2 to \$4—July 1, 1907, steerage rates fell some instead of rising. Quite recently they have been advanced, according to newspaper reports, from 50 cents and 75 cents, as the result of a meeting of this joint conference of steamship representatives in England. I do not recall whether it was at Liverpool or London that the meeting was held. I think those two facts show——

The CHAIRMAN. What are the rates charged now?

Mr. PATTEN. They vary from about \$36 to \$38 and \$39, depending upon the port, vessel, and so forth. Thirty-seven dollars and fifty cents is commonly quoted as the average.

Mr. BURNETT. The steerage rate, you mean?

Mr. PATTEN. Yes; that is what I understand from the best information I have been able to obtain.

Mr. BURNETT. I understood you to state a while ago that they varied from \$16 up to \$18?

Mr. PATTEN. That was during the seventies and eighties, before this combine was formed. They went up as high as \$25 and down as low as \$12, I believe.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. They then had a rate war?

Mr. PATTEN. That ran over a number of years, Mr. Küstermann. That is perfectly true; there was competition then—what the transportation companies call "ruinous, cut-throat competition"—which was effectually eliminated by this pooling, or gentlemen's agreement, or combination. The point is, there is a combination or effective agreement amounting to a practical monopoly so far as rates in general are concerned. Competition is eliminated and they do charge—combinations are said to charge on the principle of what is called "monopoly price;" that is, they fix the figure at the price that will yield them the greatest possible aggregate profit. That is what the steamships certainly seem to be doing in the matter of steerage rates. I do not believe the additional head tax of \$10 provided in this bill would cause much, if any, of a rise in rates, for the reason the steamships are now charging the steerage traffic all it will bear. I referred to those two instances—the increase in the steerage rate, without any increase in the per capita steamship tax, and the maintenance of and falling of the rate, in the face of a 300 per cent increase in the per capita steamship tax, or so-called "head tax," between 1899 and 1908.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Isn't the increased rate caused by the fact that meats and so forth are so much higher now than then—that they are compelled to charge more now?

Mr. PATTEN. Well, there are many contributing forces; for instance some say high prices are due to combinations alone; others attribute them to protective tariffs, and so forth.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. The cost of provisions is more to-day than it was then?

Mr. BURNETT. The increases were made before the cost of provisions became so great.

Mr. PATTEN. It followed immediately on the heels of this combination or conference, the getting together, the gentlemen's agreement, or whatever they may call it; and it followed gradually.

Mr. HAYES. I want to suggest to Mr. Küstermann that he would hardly claim that these foreign steamship companies buy their food in this country.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Quite a little.

Mr. BURNETT. On their return trip they might make purchases here, but when they bring these immigrants to this country I do not imagine they make purchases in this country.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. They tell me they get part of it here; they get their vegetables here, and some meats, too.

Mr. HAYES. But the greater quantity they do not buy in this country?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. They buy where they can buy the cheapest, of course.

Mr. PATTEN. It does not seem to me that a tax of \$10 could be shifted to any great extent upon the steerage passengers. I do not believe it would be, because the steerage traffic is being charged all it will bear. Now, as to the need for an increase in this revenue. That is shown, for instance, by the fact that the urgent deficiency bill, which passed yesterday, carried a large deficiency appropriation for the Immigration Service. In the second place, it is shown by the fact, as Chairman Tawney said yesterday, that the immigrant fund was abolished July 1 last, as a result, chiefly, of there being a deficiency, or a threatened deficiency, in that special fund one year ago. The immigrant fund was a special fund composed of "head-tax" moneys and was used for defraying the direct expenses of the Immigration Service. I have here——

The CHAIRMAN. Wouldn't there be a deficiency in the immigrant fund for all expenses were it not for the fact that the law provides that after so much has been received the rest shall go into the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. PATTEN. Pardon me, but I will take up that point in connection with the financial statement to be found in the annual report of the Commissioner-General for the year ending June 30, 1908.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Before you proceed, who are you representing here?

Mr. PATTEN. Well, that is a hard question to answer short of a couple of paragraphs, I suppose, but at present——

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I wanted to know whether you were here in person or——

Mr. PATTEN. I am not representing the Government, of course. I am secretary of the Immigrant Restriction League that has its, you might say, domicile in Boston, Mass. Then, too, I am chairman of the national legislative committee of the American Purity Federation, whose president, Mr. B. S. Steadwell, has his office at La Crosse, Wis., and indirectly I represent certain other associations, organizations, and societies. I might say, though, that I am here more as a result of my own personal interest in the problem than anything else.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I simply wanted to know.

Mr. BURNETT. I would like to state that Mr. Patten came at the request of Mr. Hayes, a member of this committee, to make this statement.

Mr. HAYES. He has this data in his mind and I have not.

Mr. PATTEN. I would like to add that I came without making any special preparation further than glancing over some data on the way from the court-house, where my profession, that of an attorney, took me earlier in the morning. According to the financial statement to be found in the report of the Commissioner-General, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, the balance at the beginning of that year, July 1, 1907, in the "immigrant fund" was \$3,079,515.26; whereas at the close there was a balance on hand of only \$550,917.04. That shows that the disbursements for that year, the fiscal year of 1907, exceeded the receipts, as far as the immigrant fund was concerned, by \$2,163,825.95, but the actual receipts from this steamship per capita tax was only \$2,500,000, whereas it should have been three and almost a half million dollars, the difference being covered into the general receipts of the Treasury, rather than paid into the special immigrant fund, owing to the limitation imposed by the act of February 20, 1907. The actual deficit or actual excess of disbursements over receipts was \$618,277.63, even though the largest number of aliens in our history entered the country that year—that is, 1,438,469 aliens. Now, these facts, for instance, this financial statement of that year——

The CHAIRMAN. Have you the receipts of last year and the expenditures?

Mr. PATTEN. No, I have not; I am sorry, Mr. Howell.

Mr. BURNETT. One reason for that deficit, I suppose, was because of the falling off of immigration during the panicky times, wasn't it?

Mr. PATTEN. No, I believe not; for that was the largest year's immigration in the history of our country; almost a million and a half of aliens came to the United States. The precise number was 1,438,469 aliens for the fiscal year of 1907, I believe.

Mr. HAYES. That is the largest year we have ever had.

Mr. PATTEN. Yet the disbursements exceeded the receipts by over a half-million dollars. Now it is perfectly true that there were several items that year, several of a million dollars each carried over from the previous year, while there were always both debit and credit items carried over in respect to that fund; that year is an exception; but the fact cuts both ways, for it explains the extraordinarily large balance at the beginning of the year. Whichever way the fact is argued, there was left only a balance of half a million dollars in the immigrant fund at the end of the fiscal year of 1907. I would like to say, too, in connection with that balance, that the Government, during the eighties and nineties, made a number of appropriations for the Immigration Service, and even to-day makes indirect appropriations that really ought to be charged up to the Immigration Service. Only the direct expenses seem to be charged. If you have the report of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor in the room, I think I can show that last year there was a deficit of between two and three hundred thousand dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. After including the amount covered into the Treasury?

Mr. PATTEN. On the 1st of last July the special immigrant fund was abolished; the report of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, about three-fourths of the way over, contains a financial statement showing the expenditures and receipts for his whole department. Among those items is the Immigration Bureau, as a separate subdivision, and I believe certain items on the two pages of his report show the disbursements there exceed the receipts by between two and three hundred thousand dollars for the immigration service itself. Those are the direct expenditures and do not include the indirect expenditures, and do not include the items in the last deficiency bills.

Mr. HAYES. I have understood—I have it from the best of authority—that the immigration service has at present a ruling to this effect: That the statutes of the United States do not require them to collect this tax from immigrants who have heretofore been in the United States and are returning—who have heretofore been domiciled here—no matter whether they have been away twenty years or not; and if they return, it is stated, the immigration officials not only do not collect the tax but they do not inspect them; they treat them as natives.

Mr. PATTEN. Yes, Mr. Hayes, and I am informed that under the Straus rules and regulations there is that classification of aliens, and that even a returning alien, no matter whether he is suffering from trachoma or tuberculosis, having once been in the United States, and even though he has not made application for naturalization papers or declared his intention, is admitted. There seems to be a need of some legislative definition of "alien" by Congress, I should think.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. You do not mean to say that the Secretary authorizes the admission of an alien who, when coming to any port in the United States, has a contagious or infectious disease?

Mr. PATTEN. Yes, sir; I understand there are instances on record, and that such are the instructions. The state board of alienists of New York could furnish correspondence had with the department, wherein insane aliens, for instance, were admitted and allowed to go into private hospitals during the administration of Secretary Straus; the Secretary advocated such admissions openly, publicly, and contrary to law, it seemed to me, or rather my interpretation of the law.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. You spoke of a direction by the Secretary or a construction made by the Secretary, authorizing and directing the admission of an alien into the United States, although such alien at the time had a contagious or infectious disease, providing such alien had at some time theretofore been in the United States. Now, then, was there any official direction or any paper emanating from the Department of Commerce and Labor that contained such direction?

Mr. PATTEN. I am not sure, but I think you will find that in decision 117 or 116.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Well, do you know whether it is there?

Mr. PATTEN. There were a great many decisions made that were never printed, but I know immigration officials have told me they have those instructions.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Pardon me a moment. You have stated that Secretary Straus construed the law in such a way as to authorize and

direct the admission of an alien who had a contagious or infectious disease. Now, that rather harshly criticises the Secretary and subjects the Secretary to criticism from certain quarters. Now, I want to know from you whether there was any such order issued or whether there is any report that contains such direction by Secretary Straus.

Mr. PATTEN. Yes, sir; I think——

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I do not want you to guess at it.

Mr. PATTEN. If you will pardon me, I know that such instructions must have been given, because the immigration inspectors and officials told me that they were so authorized. In the second place, I am quite sure that you will find that in decision 116 or 117; I am pretty sure of that.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Have you examined that decision?

Mr. PATTEN. Yes, sir; I have; and I am very sure it is there and argued out at length. I have not looked at those decisions since about a year ago. I have not read them during the past twelve months. I am not sure that the instruction or rule is there, but I am confident the argument and all is there with reference to this specific point.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Did the Secretary, in the decision which you state bears out your statement, say what was to become of that alien who had the contagious disease on arriving at any of the ports of the United States?

Mr. PATTEN. I was simply discussing the point——

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I want to know that.

Mr. PATTEN. Just a minute, and I will try to answer your question. My object was to simply bring out the present interpretation and construction of the word "alien" in partial answer to Mr. Hayes's question. They distinguish between alien immigrants and nonimmigrants, and when it comes to paying the head tax they distinguish and have construed strictly the word "alien" to mean, as I understand, an alien arriving in this country for the first time.

Mr. HAYES. That is the way I understand it.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Yes; but I was trying to get at the alleged direction of Secretary Straus, to which you referred, or the document in which the direction you say was made by Secretary Straus is made or reported. I want to get that perfectly clear; I want to examine it.

Mr. PATTEN. However I may feel in the premises I was not trying to personally or harshly criticise anyone. I made the statement simply upon the authority of certain immigration officials, and my best recollection of decisions 116 and 117. The last immigration act, that of February 20, 1907, went into effect during Secretary Straus's administration, he having taken office, I believe, on the 16th or 17th of the previous December. It became his official duty to supervise the drawing up of the regulations, the revised rules and regulations under which the act of February 20, 1907, went into effect, on July 1, 1907, and was to be executed; that was all.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. You have been rather guessing, have you not?

Mr. PATTEN. Beg pardon; no, sir; I have not.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. It seems to me you have.

Mr. HAYES. There is no question about it at all.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. If Mr. Hayes says it is so I will accept it as so.

Mr. HAYES. Well, I have it on the highest authority.

Mr. SABATH. What became of that alien that you speak of, the one you said was permitted to land?

Mr. PATTEN. Well, I do not know for sure. However, there is correspondence in the department and correspondence in the office of the state board of alienists, of New York State, with regard to one instance in particular that occurs to me.

Mr. SABATH. You spoke of a certain case?

Mr. PATTEN. The alien has never been deported, although the state authorities of New York have asked for deportation a number of times, unless very recently, I am sure.

Mr. SABATH. What was the order or permission that the Secretary gave with regard to that alien being placed in a hospital?

Mr. PATTEN. In a private hospital, but not in a public hospital.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; and the cost to be defrayed by——

Mr. PATTEN. By private charity; but that alien afterwards became a public charge, later on, I believe.

Mr. SABATH (continuing). The friends of the alien?

Mr. PATTEN. Precisely.

Mr. SABATH. Not at the expense of the Government?

Mr. PATTEN. No. But that one became a public charge later on for a short time, and it was then that the state authorities asked for the deportation and were refused, is my best recollection.

Mr. SABATH. How many such cases do you know of?

Mr. PATTEN. I do not know of so very many, because they are difficult to hear of. You will understand I do not make a specialty of seeking this particular kind of information. When I hear of these cases, I try to note them.

Mr. SABATH. All you know is about this one case?

Mr. PATTEN. I know of others.

Mr. SABATH. How many others?

Mr. PATTEN. I could not say definitely.

Mr. SABATH. Two or three?

Mr. PATTEN. Well, just a few cases; I have not made a specialty of collecting statistics in that particular field.

Mr. BURNETT. How about the present administration of affairs at Ellis Island? Do they follow the same course?

Mr. PATTEN. I might say in that connection, if the committee will pardon me, that I prepared the first written charges and helped to prepare the second set of charges against Mr. Williams's predecessor which seem to have been established to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor and the administration. I mention this by way of indicating my knowledge of conditions at Ellis Island. There has been a complete change at Ellis Island under Mr. Williams. I would like to read to the committee, in this connection, an extract from a report made by James Bronson Reynolds bearing on this point, and if the committee cares to have it, I will leave the whole extract in order that it may be printed in the hearings.

Mr. BURNETT. I would like to hear it read now, because we are probably going to take up the bills directly:

Mr. PATTEN. This extract seems to me to show, too, the need of a more liberal treatment of our immigrants at our ports of entry in the way of providing better facilities and employing more and better and competent help, and also the building of hospitals, contagious

wards, and other facilities of that kind. James Bronson Reynolds in 1906 was directed by President Roosevelt—as you know he was referred to as one of President Roosevelt's special investigators—to investigate conditions at Ellis Island with regard to the treatment and care of the insane and mentally defective immigrants. He made a report to President Roosevelt in which, among other things, he said—this was the time that Mr. Watchorn was Commissioner of Immigration at Ellis Island:

There is also no attendant for the common toilet, the only entrance to which is from the women's section.

He is here describing the room in which the mentally defective and suspected alien insane persons were detained. I have seen this room; was there at the time Mr. Reynolds was investigating, and know that what he says here is true, and know that he could have made it much stronger and not exaggerated the conditions then existing.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Is the building in that condition now?

Mr. PATTEN. No, sir; after this report went in certain changes were made immediately and without any appropriation by Congress; but it is bad enough still, as will appear from Commissioner Williams's last report:

I was informed that the commissioner had promised last spring—

This was in the fall—

to provide a separate toilet for the women, but at the time of my visit in September, nothing had been done. I consider the situation just described scandalous. Some detained immigrants, if not actually insane, are of highly nervous sensibility, while others are moral degenerates, and the danger of driving the former into actual insanity and of giving free rein to the vices of the latter does not need further argument.

Then he goes on to describe the sleeping quarters and so forth. He says that in that room there were from 30 to 40 immigrants—men, women, and children—detained, and that there was no regular attendant, no segregation of the sexes, and that he visited it several times and found the door locked, and a man on guard outside. Now, that was the condition of the detention room on the second floor at Ellis Island in September, 1906. My point is that that shows the need of a more liberal provision for facilities at our ports of entry. Until recently Boston has had no station owned by the Government. The immigrants are inspected on the steamship dock and when detained taken to a wooden structure just across the river, at Long Wharf, for further inspection and examination. I believe the same is true of Baltimore, Philadelphia, and other points, New York being the only place of importance which has had, until very recently, adequate—and those are really inadequate—government-owned facilities for examining and taking care of immigrants.

Mr. SABATH. Do you know, sir, that this committee reported a bill two years ago, and the House passed the bill, appropriating \$125,000 for a new immigrant station at Boston, and also appropriated for an immigrant station at Philadelphia?

Mr. PATTEN. Yes, sir; I was aware of it, but it seems to be a question whether Philadelphia will get her immigrant station—of course, through no fault of the Government. However, I do not think these appropriations are adequate. Let me describe to you part of the conditions at Ellis Island at present.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I would prefer that you describe the conditions in full.

Mr. PATTEN. It would take several books to do that, I fear, even if I could. However, there is pretty full information in regard to the lack of adequate buildings, space for detaining immigrants, officials, and so forth, here in the last annual report of Commissioner Williams. Perhaps I had better read several paragraphs from it. Mr. Williams took office the 28th of last May, and this report was written one month and three days after he had assumed his duties at Ellis Island. Among other things—and if the committee would desire to have it published in these hearings, and I would suggest that it seems well worth publishing, every word of it—I will leave it with the stenographer. Mr. Williams says:

If the immigration law is to be executed at Ellis Island with the thoroughness which its importance requires, both more men and more space must be provided. It frequently happens that 5,000 aliens arrive in one day. With the inspectors force at my disposal not over two minutes can be devoted to each of them at the first inspection, at which over 70 per cent are usually admitted. Those held for special inquiry of course receive further investigation, of which I am not speaking now. The inadequacy of the period of two minutes above mentioned is emphasized further when we remember that there are now 38 questions to be asked and notations made in response thereto on the manifest. And to accomplish even this inadequate inspection the inspectors must work nine hours almost continuously. The situation becomes infinitely worse when 5,000 arrive on each of two or three succeeding days. I see that in May, 1907, 150,000 arrived, or an average of 5,000 a day for each of thirty-one successive days. This may happen again, and I feel it my duty to state plainly that if it does, full or proper inspection will, in the absence of increased facilities, be out of the question, both for lack of time and lack of physical and mental endurance on the part of the officials.

The question will be asked, Why should there be received at Ellis Island on any one day more immigrants than can be carefully inspected? My inclination, of course, is to take only such a number (say 3,000) and, so far as practicable, I shall act accordingly. But if, with an average of 5,000 a day for one month, I were to decline to receive over 3,000 a day it might well be charged that it was the duty of the Government to make timely provision for the proper inspection of such number of immigrants as were likely to arrive, so that commerce need not be improperly impeded or immigrants unnecessarily kept aboard iron ships, oftentimes in hot weather. As the Immigration Service is self-supporting (or, if not, can readily be made so), there seems special reasons why adequate facilities should exist for the prompt and efficient transaction of all business. Even at the writing of this report, with immigration far from its highest figure—

Last year there came to this country on an average about 80,000 aliens per month; over 944,000 all told, I think, entered the country last year; that is, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909.

Mr. BURNETT. And has been increasing since?

Mr. PATTEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. It has been decreasing.

Mr. BURNETT. Since last July?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I think so.

Mr. HAYES. As compared with the year before it has been increasing.

Mr. BURNETT. That is what I mean.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I have merely the statements from newspapers.

Mr. PATTEN (reading):

Even at the writing of this report, with immigration far from its highest figure, many of the officials are obliged to work overtime day after day. Not a few are on duty over ten hours. There is here a force of very willing workers, but that, I submit, is no reason why a large number of them should be called, sometimes for several days in succession, to render services involving unusually long hours.

There does not seem to me to be work much more taxing than that of the immigration officials at Ellis Island, and certainly none could be of much more importance to the country or the immigrant than the humane handling of all those immigrants and the proper enforcement of our immigration laws.

As regards additional space required, I call particular attention to the lack of quarters for the transaction of that very important branch of ours known as "special inquiry." The room in which immigrants held for this purpose are detained is so inadequate as to be a reproach to the Government. Almost the same can be said of the room in which witnesses appearing before the boards are compelled to await their turn to testify. There are but three proper court rooms, whereas six boards have since June 1 frequently been in session. There should be treble the space that we now have for the various kinds of "special-inquiry" work, but I shall defer specific recommendations until later.

Three of these boards were compelled to meet out in the hallway or large inspection room. As I recall each board has three members. It hears witnesses and decides the fate of immigrants detained by the inspectors as likely to become public charges or for other reasons, such as contract laborers demanding a hearing, and the testimony of witnesses. With regard to hospital facilities, the commissioner says:

Our hospital facilities, thanks to the recent construction of a contagious-disease hospital on the new island, will probably now be adequate, except that there is no proper ward for holding for observation cases in which it is suspected that the alien may be affected mentally.

Then we come back to this detention room on the second floor, described by James Bronson Reynolds, who reported for President Roosevelt merely on the treatment of insane and mentally defective immigrants at Ellis Island in 1906, as a result, I believe, of complaints filed by the attorney of state board of lunacy of New York or the state board of alienists.

Certain wooden barracks are now used for this purpose. They were never intended to stand permanently, and furthermore are dangerous by reason of their inflammability. Here, too, I shall defer specific recommendations until later, only pointing out now that something must be done before long.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Will you pardon me at this stage? When did you last examine the conditions at Ellis Island?

Mr. PATTEN. The first week in December.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. How do those conditions compare with the conditions to which you have now referred?

Mr. PATTEN. I think there has been a complete transformation in conditions at Ellis Island, so far as it is within human capacity to change them. I think Commissioner Williams has brought that about unquestionably, and is doing everything a competent and efficient commissioner could do.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. So that the conditions are fairly good, would you say?

Mr. PATTEN. No, sir; I do not think they begin to be what they ought to be. I think the detention room, as you know, Mr. Goldfogle, and the room in which witnesses are detained, are, as Commissioner Williams says, a reproach to our Government.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I think it is.

Mr. BURNETT. It is not the fault of the management there, but because of inadequate facilities?

Mr. PATTEN. You will find, I think, in this urgent deficiency appropriation bill, which passed yesterday, that something like

\$90,000 is appropriated to make needed changes that simply can not wait, and ought to have been taken care of at least a year ago.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Well, they are very much needed.

Mr. PATTEN. Now, in regard to the change in conditions there, I would like——

Mr. HAYES. I would like to have it understood that that report, from which he has read, shall be incorporated as part of the hearings, if there is no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Couldn't we get all of that out of the report of the immigration commissioner?

Mr. HAYES. Has it been published?

Mr. PATTEN. It has not been published, I am sure.

Mr. SABATH. Has it not been published as the report of the commissioner?

Mr. PATTEN. No, sir; but it will be published. Part of it will be, I think, but not all of it, I feel certain.

Mr. SABATH. How do you know?

Mr. PATTEN. I have been so informed.

Mr. SABATH. It is queer that you can obtain this information from the officials when Members of Congress can not.

Mr. HAYES. Yes; we can obtain the information.

Mr. PATTEN. It was through a Congressman and an official here in Washington that I was given to understand that and that the annual report of the commissioner-general would be out the last of this month.

Mr. BURNETT. I would like to insert a little extract from a paper showing the recommendation of Mr. C. V. Collins, superintendent of state prisons at Albany, N. Y. It is dated January 23.

Mr. SABATH. Is it taken from a newspaper?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes, sir; the Washington Post. It states:

That the recently remarkable increase in prison population in New York State is due largely to the influx of immigrants into the State is the conclusion of C. V. Collins, superintendent of state prisons, who, in his annual report to the legislature, suggests that the Federal Government, which permits these alien criminals to land on its shores, should assume the burden of maintaining them till they have served their sentences, when they could be deported and never allowed to return. A census of 4,320 prisoners in Sing Sing, Auburn, and Clinton prisons showed that 1,091, or 25 per cent, were aliens.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Don't you think we ought to be more rigid at the various ports in ascertaining whether the immigrants were convicted of crimes in the foreign countries, and whether they were accused of crime and were under indictment?

Mr. BURNETT. I think so; and we should deport them after they get here and become criminals.

Mr. PATTEN. They are all asked that question now.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. In addition to obtaining the answer of the alien there might be some method devised by which some fair examination might be made into the cases of persons suspected, reasonably suspected.

Mr. HAYES. Along that line, since I have been here this time, since this Congress opened, I have had some correspondence with people in my own city. It seems that an Italian who had been convicted and served a sentence for manslaughter in Italy was admitted to this country something over a year ago—nearly two years ago—and was living quietly in San Jose, Santa Clara County, Cal. The

immigration officials were informed that he had been convicted of a crime and, on the warrant of the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor, he was arrested and held for investigation. In the course of this investigation his attorney and friends there wrote me to exert my influence to prevent his deportation, which, of course, I was very fast to do. He was, by the way, deported. That indicates how lax our methods are in these matters.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I think we could greatly improve our methods.

Mr. HAYES. I think we should.

Mr. PATTEN. Following up the newspaper clipping which Congressman Burnett read, I would say that, according to the letters written by New York state officials, to be found in the Congressional Record of July 8, 1909, and read in a speech by Hon. Lee S. Overman, Senator from North Carolina, it costs New York State in the neighborhood of from fifteen to twenty millions of dollars a year to maintain the foreign-born, or, rather, the alien, inmates in New York state institutions—that is, prisons, asylums, almshouses, etc. According to Senator Overman, about one-fourth of the taxes raised in New York are raised for that purpose, i. e., for the support of foreign-born deficient, dependents, and delinquents.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. One-fourth of the taxes of New York, do you mean?

Mr. PATTEN. That is as I understand his speech.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. You are drawing your conclusions from some statements made by the Senator, are you?

Mr. PATTEN. He was a Democratic Senator——

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I do not care about that, whether he was a Democratic Senator or whether he was a Republican Senator; what difference does that make? I do not think the witness should have undertaken to mention the politics of anybody. This is a subject which concerns all the people, whether Democrats, Republicans, or members of any other political faith; this is a nonpolitical matter.

Mr. PATTEN. My only point with regard to that was to show that this was nonpartisan; the statements are made by Republican state officials and used by a Democratic Senator.

Mr. SABATH. Can you say now that the information you read in that speech is really justified by any facts that have been produced by anyone anywhere in the State of New York?

Mr. HAYES. Why, Mr. Patten stated that the information came from New York State officials.

Mr. PATTEN. It is used in the speech and is information that came from state officers of New York. I meant no offense by referring to Senator Overman as a Democrat, any more than to bring out the point that it was a nonpartisan presentation of the case. It must have been, because he is of a different political faith than the state officials. That was all I meant to emphasize, and I beg your pardon if what I said was taken in any other sense. I meant no offense at all; I did not mean to bring any politics into the matter. With regard to changes at Ellis Island, I beg to call the committee's attention to the next to the last paragraph of Commissioner Williams's report, which shows another of the changes he has brought about since he returned to the post. He says:

It is very annoying to have to report that some of the immigrant aid societies represented at Ellis Island are grossly mismanaged. When I was commissioner before, I

was compelled to take drastic action in respect of several, and I shall do so again in all instances where investigation may show this to be proper. A few of these societies are mere commercial institutions in which the immigrant is not only exploited, but compelled to remain in filthy surroundings and foul atmosphere. Societies of this class will shortly be either reformed or removed altogether from the island, and none should welcome this action more than the good ones, of which there are several here, working really in the interest of the immigrants and incidentally aiding the Government.

Mr. SABATH. That has been done; he has removed many of these societies?

Mr. PATTEN. I would like to say that when he left as commissioner, three years ago, there were something like 18 of such societies, represented by about 50 agents, and that when he returned, as I recall, there were 94 or 96 agents.

Mr. BURNETT. How many now?

Mr. PATTEN. He has reduced the number, and is weeding out those that are there for strictly commercial or immoral purposes and leaving the legitimate ones, of which there are many. I am not cocksure as to the numbers. All these facts seem to show that there should be larger appropriations of money for the immigrant service at Ellis Island, not only in the way of providing additional buildings and facilities, but in the way of employing more and more efficient inspectors and increasing the pay of the men engaged in doing this difficult and important work.

Mr. BURNETT. You think that in order to meet those additional expenses there ought to be an increase of the head tax, in order to let the alien at least help to pay it?

Mr. PATTEN. Yes, sir. As I have said, I do not regard the alien as really bearing the incidence of the present tax, and——

Mr. BURNETT. Well, somebody pays it.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. We are arriving at it. If I am in business, I find out the expense of running that business, and the steamship companies are finding out what the expenses are.

Mr. HAYES. It is clear profit to them; almost clear profit.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. This head tax?

Mr. HAYES. No; the immigrant business. They do not furnish them with any food to speak of, and what they do get is the cheapest kind of fare.

Mr. PATTEN. It was testified by experts before the Industrial Commission that the total cost of bringing an immigrant here in the steerage was not over \$7; that the food alone cost, for the entire trip, about \$1.70; that was the testimony of an ex-commissioner, I think.

Mr. BURNETT. That was what time?

Mr. PATTEN. The Report on Immigration, Volume XV, was issued in 1901, and the testimony was taken a year or two before.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. What is the average charge to the immigrant?

Mr. PATTEN. Now, about \$37.50; I think about that.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. So that the profit would be about \$30?

Mr. PATTEN. According to those figures. It is, of course, a very difficult matter to ascertain the cost of producing a service like bringing a person here in the steerage. It does not cost a railroad company, for instance, very much to run an extra train, practically nothing to carry an extra additional passenger on that train; neither does it cost a steamship company very much to carry an extra passenger, and

when it is all confused by the carriage of freight, mails, and other things of that kind, it is pretty difficult, I think, for these transportation companies to figure what the cost is of the specific service of bringing an immigrant to this country in the steerage. There seems to be a joint cost of producing the service, but no specific cost that can be arrived at.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Not as to that one, but they can take the average. They do not always have full cargoes, do they?

Mr. PATTEN. No, sir; I believe not.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. And for that reason they have got to take the average; that is the only way they can arrive at it. I can assure you they must take into consideration the interest on their investment, how much it costs to run and how much to keep them, and so on. There is no question about that.

Mr. PATTEN. It is true in the history of steerage-passenger rates that for a number of years the steerage rate was below \$20; then they combined and formed this pool, as the result of which there are, I understand, three conferences in Europe and England which fix the rates for all the lines except, maybe, a few little ones that do not amount to a drop in the bucket.

Mr. BURNETT. Did they make a large increase at once?

Mr. PATTEN. They put it up gradually. They put it from below \$20 to an average of about \$37.50 long before 1899. Every once in a while, if you watch the papers, you will see that this conference has met and made some change in steerage-passenger or other rates. They recently met and increased steerage rates slightly, according to the newspapers—within the last three weeks, I think. I know there might be instances where they could shift the incidence of the tax, but they do not seem to have been able to do so in 1903 or in 1907, when the tax was doubled each time and there was no change in rates upward either time, and there was a slight change downward in 1907, following right on the heels of the increase in the tax from \$2 to \$4. I am inclined to think that the steamship companies fix the steerage rates and other rates, as long as there is no strong competition, on the principle of monopoly price, charging the traffic all it will bear, fixing the rate where it will yield the greatest possible aggregate profit. Consequently, to my mind, a tax up to \$10, as advocated before the Industrial Commission in 1900, would not be shifted to any extent upon the steerage by increased rates. It seems to me it would be borne entirely or almost so by the foreign steamship companies and would come out of their profits.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Don't you think that such a head tax placed upon the steamship companies would increase the cost of transportation to the alien?

Mr. PATTEN. I do not believe so. They have increased it about a dollar recently, I understand. They might, but I doubt it very much. They did not do so July 1, 1907, when the tax was increased from \$2 to \$4.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Last year neither the North German-Lloyd nor the Hamburg-American Line paid 1 per cent dividend. I know they did not. They could not. Their stocks went down 20 per cent—that is, 20 points. It shows that at that rate they were not making any money. Now, then, if you increase their expenses their profits

will be still less; so the thing is to get right down and see how much they are making. If they are making an outrageous profit on their immigration service, then they can well afford to pay this.

Mr. PATTEN. It is certainly true that the steamship companies every year build a larger number of boats. Bigger boats and faster boats are put on the service every little while to engage in the immigrant-carrying business, and that is what seems to me so strange, that they would go on investing so much money in a business if it did not pay.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Well, the boats wear out. And it is not the passenger trade, it is their freight trade, that helps them out; and last year there was so little of that that they actually could not pay any dividends at all, not one cent, while the year before they were able and did pay 6 per cent, and the Lloyd Company even paid 8 per cent. That was the biggest year they ever had.

Mr. HAYES. The immigrant business helps them out some.

Mr. SABATH. The exports and imports fell off in 1907 and 1908, and that is the reason their dividends were cut down and the reason why their business was much smaller than it was in 1906 and 1905.

Mr. PATTEN. I might say, with respect to steerage rates and conditions, that so far as I am informed this is the only country in the world with any considerably large net foreign immigration. Figures were published in the Congressional Record of April 26 last, in a speech made by Senator Overman, which showed that fact, and that at \$37.50 per passenger the steamships take in from fifty to one hundred millions of dollars annually from the steerage business alone. Partial statistics are given for the United States, Canada, Australia, Peru, Brazil, and the Argentine Republic, and so forth; those statistics, according to this table, are taken from the consular reports and monthly bulletins of the South American Republics, etc. They seem to show that the United States is the only country where there is any considerable net foreign immigration; that is, any considerable excess of alien immigration over alien emigration.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Did you say South America?

Mr. PATTEN. It gives the figures for important South American countries. I mean there is an efflux from those countries about equal to influx.

Mr. BURNETT. Of natives you mean?

Mr. PATTEN. No; of aliens.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. It is claimed that immigration has built up this country; so we are glad to have them.

Mr. BURNETT. That is not so now.

Mr. HAYES. It fills up the slums.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. A great many of those to whom objection has been made are doing the hard, manual work of tunneling, digging in the mines, and so forth.

Mr. HAYES. Some of them are, but not many.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Doing some of the work that Americans would not do, some of the work that some of the "better classes," as they have been called, I think, by the gentleman from California, would not do.

Mr. PATTEN. Commissioner Williams has something to say about the character of present immigration, and if the committee would care to hear it I will be glad to read this paragraph.

Mr. HAYES. I should be glad to have it.

Mr. PATTEN. It is an expression of his opinion. He handles about 80 per cent of the present influx. I believe it is right in line with expressions to be found in previous reports. Unquestionably Commissioner Williams is the only man in recent years at Ellis Island who seems to have been well equipped—that is, in my humble opinion—for that important task; well equipped in every way; absolutely independent financially, with splendid mental training, a man of great innate ability. I have understood he ranks up well with his fellow-men in the legal profession at New York City. He says:

I have already adverted to the easy-going character of our exclusion laws and stated that even their strict enforcement would keep out only the very bad elements of foreign countries. Between these elements and those that are a real benefit to the country (as so many of our immigrants are) there lies a class who may be quite able to earn a living here, but who in doing so tend to pull down our standards of living. I am not now concerned with the question whether or not laws can be framed which will correctly describe this undesirable class.

I wish merely to emphasize, what must be known to every thinking person, that it is coming here in considerable numbers and that we are making no effort to exclude it. Few people are bold enough to claim that we are in urgent need of any more immigrants who will crowd into the congested districts of our large cities. And yet this is where a large percentage of our immigrants now go and stay. At the time when portions of the West are crying for out-of-door labor the congestion in New York City may be increasing at the rate of many thousands per month. Another way of putting this is to say that much of our present-day immigration is not responsive to the legitimate demands for additional labor in the United States. I think this fact should be made known throughout those sections of our country where many erroneously think that further restrictions of the right kind would increase the difficulties incident to obtaining labor for which there is a real demand. Quite the contrary is the case, for poor immigration tends to deter good immigrants from coming.

That is, the steamship companies will fill their steerage, if not with one class with another class, and as long as uninterfered with will bring the class which is the most profitable. They seek the most profitable traffic.

Mr. BURNETT. From what report are you reading?

Mr. PATTEN. The last annual report of Commissioner Williams, commissioner of immigration at Ellis Island, New York Harbor. It is dated August 8, 1909. It has not been published as yet, I believe.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Our State lately appointed an immigration commissioner to get the so-called "undesirables," many of them, to our State. We need labor.

Mr. HAYES. But they do not go.

Mr. SABATH (to Mr. Hayes). Do you get many of them from Europe?

Mr. HAYES. We get all that we need; but we would be very glad to exchange some of the Japanese for some of those from other countries.

Mr. SABATH. I agree with you on that question, but how many European immigrants do you receive in the State of California, or how many have you received during the last year?

Mr. HAYES. Well, we do not receive scarcely any directly through the ports of San Francisco or Seattle, but they come overland from New York. The Italian to whom I referred was one who came from New York. We get quite a number from the north of Italy who are excellent immigrants.

Mr. PATTEN. About a year ago they brought East a carload of insane aliens from California for deportation. I might say, in connection with the statement made by Mr. Küstermann, that the experience of the State of South Carolina is interesting in that connection. It established a bureau of immigration four or five years ago. Some of the money for the work of that bureau was collected from the mill men. The State had not appropriated enough, apparently. Two cargoes of immigrants were brought to South Carolina on the *Witte-kind*—the first one in November, 1906, and one the following February—and distributed throughout the State by the state commissioner. I understand that the Bureau of Labor has found that there are not more than 10 per cent of those immigrants in South Carolina to-day. On the 4th of last March South Carolina adopted a law abolishing the bureau of immigration and affirmatively forbidding an official of the State "to attempt, directly or indirectly, to bring foreign immigrants into the State."

Mr. SABATH. Do you know why they did not remain there?

Mr. BURNETT. They wanted to go to New York.

Mr. PATTEN. That is another question.

Mr. SABATH. Do you also know the cause they assigned for leaving?

Mr. PATTEN. There are a great many reasons.

Mr. SABATH. Well, the main reason, the main cause. Let us have it all. You know what I mean?

Mr. PATTEN. In the first place, as a rule that class of immigrants, particularly those of the Mediterranean countries, have a social instinct, a social aversion to living in the country; while they may be called farmers and say they are farmers at home, they do not live on the land they cultivate; they live a more or less congested life in little communities, villages, and cities. They go out in the morning to the land they cultivate and come back to the city life in the evening. Their preference for congested city life is called a social instinct by Miss Jane Addams, and is described as being the result of centuries. They like the city, its glare, its excitement, etc. The bulk of the present immigrants do not seem to have a fondness for the West and the rural districts. According to statistics of destination, nine-tenths of our immigrants go to the States north of the Potomac River and east of the Mississippi—that is, to the large labor and industrial centers of the country.

Mr. SABATH. All farmers in European countries manage to build their buildings and homes together, in a so-called village, instead of the way it is done here, where a farmer has his home on his piece of land, on his farm. In Europe they have their buildings in the center, in the so-called village, and have the fields a short distance away from their homes, so that they can easily meet one another, and live that way much better than when they are living alone in these districts.

Mr. ELVINS. Have you given any study to the cause of the falling off of immigration from northern Europe and Scandinavia and the increase in that from southern Europe—the Mediterranean countries?

Mr. PATTEN. I think that Mr. Williams answers that where he says "poor immigration tends to deter good immigration from coming," etc.

Mr. ELVINS. In what way?

Mr. PATTEN. Now, thirty years ago practically all of our foreign immigration came from northwestern Europe; to-day practically the bulk of it, three-fourths of it, or 80 per cent of it, comes from southeastern Europe and western Asia.

Mr. ELVINS. Why is that?

Mr. PATTEN. In the first place, as I said a while ago, these large foreign steamship companies have all their departments, freight, traffic, passenger, and all that, under heads—there is a divided responsibility—a divided responsibility has helped increase the difficulties of getting at the men “higher up,” it is said, in the case of the sugar-refining company in connection with the customs frauds at New York—each department tries to increase its own profits, for various personal reasons. The men in that department, the officials and all others, have found that the southeastern European traffic is much more profitable than is the northwestern European traffic. Immigrants from the Mediterranean countries, for instance, will put up with less conveniences, can be packed in closer quarters, and hence are a more profitable traffic. The steerage report of the Immigration Commission, I believe, makes clear that steerage conditions on immigrant-carrying vessels from northwest Europe are superior.

Mr. SABATH. With the exception of Italy.

Mr. PATTEN. That is due to the fact that that traffic—the Mediterranean—will put up with less conveniences. Now, I think that illustrates the point I wanted to make, namely, that the source of our immigration has not been shifted from England and northwestern Europe owing to a diminished population, for, with the exception of Ireland, all those countries have larger populations, and England certainly to-day has more unemployed than ever before. Now, my point is this: They find so much more profit in connection with those immigrants—they can gather so many more with so much less expense and pack them in so much closer—that they have shifted the source from northwestern to southeastern Europe. Let them alone and they will go to India; they will go on tapping the most profitable traffic.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Then you mean that the steamship companies regulate this thing?

Mr. PATTEN. Yes, sir; I really believe so. I think we are leaving to their profit-making choice the selection of our immigrants entirely to too large a degree.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. The reason why there are so few immigrants from Germany at the present time is because times are good there; they are earning much more than in any other place.

Mr. PATTEN. Beg pardon, but Herr von Pillis disagrees with you in regard to that; he as well as some other German officials who lay most weight along the line of Commissioner Williams's argument.

According to page 34 of House Document No. 384, Fifty-ninth Congress, Herr von Pillis, of the German Government, said in 1903:

We view with great satisfaction the fact that few Germans emigrate to the United States, which is not due so much to the excellent conditions existing here as to the fact that your present immigrant labor has been mercilessly cheapened in America.

Mr. Burnett was there and investigated conditions, I think, in northern Europe.

Mr. BURNETT. I talked with a number of Germans in regard to that very question, and they stated, as Mr. Küstermann has that one rea-

son was that they were doing better there, and another reason was that they knew the people we were getting in this country from Italy and Sicily, as well as Greeks and Syrians, and that class of people, and that they did not want to come in contact with them any more than was necessary, and that was one of the main reasons for the falling off of immigration to this country from northwestern Europe.

Mr. SABATH. Well, I will tell you gentlemen what my opinion is. I believe we have drained Germany, we have drained Scandinavia, Ireland, and the other countries, of the best class of men, namely, the young men from 18 to 20.

Mr. HAYES. We have drained off all of their paupers, too.

Mr. SABATH. A pauper can not come. If a man must pay \$60 or \$80, that means he must have 400 or 500 marks, and a man who has 400 or 500 marks with which to pay his passage is not a pauper.

Mr. HAYES. The passage of a great many has been paid by the municipalities in those countries.

Mr. SABATH. You may have better information than I have, but I know that is not so in Germany, it is not so in Austria, and I know it is not so in Poland.

Mr. HAYES. Their passage has been paid by the municipalities or our officials have reported falsely.

(Mr. Hayes moved that the reports from which Mr. Patten read should be made a part of the hearings and printed in full, and the question being taken, the motion was agreed to.)

(Upon motion of Mr. Hayes it was agreed that further hearings in this matter be adjourned until Tuesday, February 8, 1910, at 10.30 o'clock a. m.)

ANNUAL REPORT.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
IMMIGRATION SERVICE,
New York, N. Y., August 16, 1909.

COMMISSIONER-GENERAL OF IMMIGRATION,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I became commissioner May 28, so that I have held office only during one month and three days of the period to which this report is intended to relate. The tide of immigration, which in 1908 fell to a low point, appears again to be rising rapidly, and I proceeded at once to take steps to reduce so far as possible the number of aliens ineligible under our laws who shall during the next year attempt to pass through Ellis Island. These laws, except as they relate to contract laborers, exclude only such manifestly undesirable persons as idiots, insane persons, paupers, persons likely to become public charges, persons with loathsome or dangerous contagious diseases, convicted criminals, prostitutes, etc. A mere reading of this list shows that they could not be less exacting without exposing the country to grave danger. Even their strict execution makes it possible to keep out only what may be termed "scum," or the very worst elements that seek to come here. That no one, including particularly intending immigrants, should have any misapprehension as to the policy to be followed at Ellis Island, a notice, of which the following is a copy, was issued on June 4:

"It is necessary that the standard of inspection at Ellis Island be raised. Notice hereof is given publicity in order that intending immigrants may be advised before embarkation that our immigration law will be strictly enforced; so that those who are unable to measure up to the requirements of the law may not waste their time or money in coming here only to encounter the hardships of deportation."

But actually to raise the standard of inspection at a great immigration office requires something more than a general notice. The whole official force must be carefully and uniformly trained in the exercise of proper care. It is necessary to ascertain who

does and who does not know and understand the statutes, and amongst other things to explain the facts and elements to be considered in determining whether or not an immigrant is a "pauper" or a "person likely to become a public charge." All of this requires time and patience, and one month is so short a period that I shall defer report of results until later.

On June 28 another important notice was issued and at once gave rise to so much misrepresentation that I cite it:

"Certain steamship companies are bringing to this port many immigrants whose funds are manifestly inadequate for their proper support until such time as they are likely to obtain profitable employment. Such action is improper and must cease. In the absence of a statutory provision, no hard and fast rule can be laid down as to the amount of money an immigrant must bring with him, but in most cases it will be unsafe for immigrants to arrive with less than twenty-five dollars (\$25) besides railroad ticket to destination, while in many instances they should have more. They must in addition, of course, satisfy the authorities that they will not become charges either on public or private charity."

This notice is not, as so many have claimed it to be, a rule under which inspectors must exclude immigrants with less than \$25, and thus an attempt to create a property test not found in the statutes. It is merely a humane notice to intending immigrants that upon landing they will require at least some small amount of money with which to meet their wants while looking about for employment. That it was time for the Government to serve this warning, which others should have given long ago, is shown by a mere inspection of some of the records of incoming vessels. For instance, out of 251 passengers on *S. S. Volturno* July 4, 1909, 13 had \$1, 11 had \$2, 7 had \$3, 8 had \$4, and 20 had \$5. One hundred and eighty-nine had \$10 or less, and yet the majority of these indigent people were going to congested portions of our large cities where the competition among newly arrived immigrants for a living is very great. One hundred and thirty-five were bound for New York City. Undoubtedly the principal test to which immigrants should be subjected is as to their ability to become self-supporting, but the Government may properly insist that while looking for employment they shall not run the risk of becoming objects of charity. And this leads me to remark that the practice under which penniless immigrants are allowed to qualify after arrival by receiving gifts of money from persons under no moral or legal obligation to support them is a bad one and should gradually be terminated. With this in view I added to the notice of June 28 above referred to this clause:

"Only in instances deemed by the Government to be of exceptional merit will gifts to destitute immigrants after arrival be considered in determining whether or not they are qualified to land; for, except where such gifts are to those legally entitled to support (as to wives, minor children, etc.), the recipients stand here as objects of private charity, and our statutes do not contemplate that such aliens shall enter the country."

One of many objections to such gifts is that they are often mere subterfuges to defeat the law. Instances are constantly coming to our attention where money so given is taken from the immigrant in indecent haste, at times even before he leaves the barge office. Incidentally I note that Canada (which many will be surprised to learn is now stricter than the United States as regards the admission of immigrants) declines to receive immigrants who are unable upon arrival to show \$25 which they have brought with them. They are not allowed to qualify through gifts of money received after arrival.

One reason why so many destitute immigrants come here is that there are certain wicked agencies abroad (and even in this country) whose sole purpose is to exploit immigrants, give them false advice, and circumvent our statutes. Of these agencies I shall have more to say later, and now only point out that they are not receiving the attention they deserve.

I have already adverted to the easy-going character of our exclusion laws and stated that even their strict enforcement keeps out only the very bad elements of foreign countries. Between these elements and those that are a real benefit to the country (as so many of our immigrants are) there lies a class who may be quite able to earn a living here, but who in doing so tend to pull down our standards of living. I am not now concerned with the question whether or not laws can be framed which will correctly describe this undesirable class. I wish merely to emphasize, what must be known to every thinking person, that it is coming here in considerable numbers and that we are making no effort to exclude it. Few people are bold enough to claim that we are in urgent need of any more immigrants who will crowd into the congested districts of our large cities. And yet this is where a large percentage of our immigrants now go and stay. At a time when portions of the West are crying for out-of-door labor the congestion in New York City may be increasing at the rate of many thousands per

month. Another way of putting this is to say that much of our present day immigration is not responsive to the legitimate demands for additional labor in the United States. I think this fact should be made known throughout those sections of our country where many erroneously think that further restrictions of the right kind would increase the difficulties incident to obtaining labor for which there is a real demand. Quite the contrary is the case, for poor immigration tends to deter good immigrants from coming.

If the immigration law is to be executed at Ellis Island with the thoroughness which its importance requires, both more men and more space must be provided. It frequently happens that 5,000 aliens arrive in one day. With the inspectors' force at my disposal not over two minutes can be devoted to each of them at the first inspection, at which over 70 per cent are usually admitted. Those held for special inquiry, of course, receive further investigation, of which I am not speaking now. The inadequacy of the period of two minutes above mentioned is emphasized further when we remember that there are now 38 questions to be asked and notations made in response thereto on the manifest. And to accomplish even this inadequate inspection the inspectors must work nine hours almost continuously. The situation becomes infinitely worse when 5,000 arrive on each of two or three succeeding days. I see that in May, 1907, 150,000 arrived, or an average of 5,000 a day for each of 31 successive days. This may happen again, and I feel it my duty to state plainly that if it does, full or proper inspection will, in the absence of increased facilities, be out of the question, both for lack of time and lack of physical and mental endurance on the part of the officials.

The question will be asked: Why should there be received at Ellis Island on any one day more immigrants than can be carefully inspected? My inclination, of course, is to take only such a number (say, 3,000) and so far as practicable I shall act accordingly. But if with an average of 5,000 a day for one month I were to decline to receive over 3,000 a day it might well be charged that it was the duty of the Government to make timely provision for the proper inspection of such number of immigrants as were likely to arrive, so that commerce need not be improperly impeded or immigrants unnecessarily kept aboard iron ships, oftentimes in hot weather. As the Immigration Service is self-supporting (or, if not, can readily be made so) there seems special reason why adequate facilities should exist for the prompt and efficient transaction of all business. Even at the writing of this report, with immigration far from its highest figure, many of the officials are obliged to work overtime day after day. Not a few are on duty over ten hours. There is here a force of very willing workers, but that, I submit, is no reason why a large number of them should be called upon, sometimes for several days in succession, to render services involving unusually long hours.

As regards additional space required, I call particular attention to the lack of quarters for the transaction of that very important branch of our work known as "special inquiry." The room in which immigrants held for this purpose are detained is so inadequate as to be a reproach to the Government. Almost the same can be said of the room in which witnesses appearing before the boards are compelled to await their turn to testify. There are but three proper court rooms, whereas six boards have since June 1 frequently been in session. There should be treble the space that we now have for the various kinds of "special inquiry" work, but I shall defer specific recommendations until later.

Our hospital facilities, thanks to the recent construction of a contagious-disease hospital on the new island, will probably now be adequate, except that there is no proper ward for holding for observation cases in which it is suspected that the alien may be affected mentally. Certain wooden barracks are now used for this purpose. They were never intended to stand permanently, and furthermore are dangerous by reason of their inflammability. Here, too, I shall defer specific recommendations until later, only pointing out now that something must be done before long. A fine new dormitory building recently built at a cost of about \$450,000 will facilitate materially the transaction of our business, though it is already taxed to its utmost. Unfortunately no provision has been made either for baths, forced ventilation, or freight-elevator service, all of which are important and must be added.

It is very annoying to have to report that some of the immigrant aid societies represented at Ellis Island are grossly mismanaged. When I was commissioner before, I was compelled to take drastic action in respect of several, and I shall do so again in all instances where investigation may show this to be proper. A few of these societies are mere commercial institutions, in which the immigrant is not only exploited but compelled to remain in filthy surroundings and foul atmosphere. Societies of this class will shortly be either reformed or removed altogether from the island, and none should welcome this action more than the good ones, of which there are several here working really in the interest of the immigrant and incidentally aiding the Government.

The privilege of delivering immigrants' baggage is being very badly executed, investigation showing that immigrants are being systematically overcharged by the drivers. This matter is receiving proper attention, as is also the question whether or not the contract in relation to the feeding of immigrants is being performed in strict accordance with the specification.

Respectfully,

WM. WILLIAMS, *Commissioner*.

[Part of report of J. B. Reynolds, who reported for the President on certain conditions at Ellis Island in 1906.]

MEMORANDUM REGARDING THE TREATMENT OF THE INSANE AND MENTALLY DEFECTIVE AT ELLIS ISLAND.

As requested by you, I have given special attention to the treatment of the insane and mentally defective at Ellis Island. This branch of the Bureau of Immigration is at present a part of the Marine-Hospital Service, hence is under the Treasury Department and not under the Department of Commerce and Labor. This confusion and divided responsibility may in part account for the deplorable condition which I must report.

I found that immigrants certified by the ship's doctor as insane, under an order of the commissioner-general, are not landed, but are kept on board the steamer until its return trip. These unfortunates are locked in the ship's cabins and receive no care except such as is given by ship stewards.

All arriving immigrants receive a hasty examination. Those regarded as positively mentally defective are then examined by the alienists, of whom there are three at the Island. If detained for further observation they are next taken to a special detention room. This room, which receives on an average of 30 or 40 immigrants daily, is divided by partitions extending half way to the ceiling into a doctor's examination room, a men's section and a women's section. The section supposed to be reserved for women is in fact used by both sexes. A single male attendant is in charge of the detention room, but on more than one occasion I found him sitting outside of the room, the door into it being closed, and the men and women in the room without attendants. There is no matron in charge of the women's section. I was told that one who had many other duties is supposed to occasionally visit the room, but on no occasion did I find one present.

There is also no attendant for the common toilet, the only entrance to which is from the women's section. I was informed that the commissioner had promised last spring to provide a separate toilet for the women, but at the time of my visit in September nothing had been done. I consider the situation just described scandalous. Some detained immigrants, if not actually insane, are of highly nervous sensibility, while others are moral degenerates, and the danger of driving the former into actual insanity and of giving free rein to the vices of the latter does not need further argument.

The sleeping arrangements for the mentally defective are scandalous. It has been the custom to crowd this class into large sleeping rooms with other immigrants without explanation to the night attendants of their condition and special needs. If disturbances, often the products of diseased minds, occur, the attendants naturally regard these disturbances as willful and handle them accordingly. This indiscriminate mixing of the sane and insane affords another illustration of the ignorance and indifference, not to use stronger terms, of the management. The three alienists are the only ones having to do with the mentally defective who are trained for the work. There are no trained nurses and no trained day or night attendants. The rough treatment of defective immigrants by attendants, often alleged, is quite possibly due to ignorance and lack of training. But this absence of attendants trained in the care of the insane makes the service of the bureau greatly inferior to that of the state hospitals for the insane.

The alienists assigned to the care of the mentally defective work under many difficulties. Their undivided attention should be given to the mentally defective, but not infrequently they are called upon to do general medical work. I am informed that one alienist was recently ordered to leave his special work, where patients were demanding his attention, to make general inspection "on the line," the reason being given that no other doctors were available. He protested, but obeyed orders. Subsequently other doctors appeared, but though they were assigned to duty he was kept "on the line." He finally left the line and returned to his own work. He was at once

suspended from duty for disobedience. If the facts are as stated to me he was probably technically guilty of insubordination, and his chief was within his rights in suspending him, but the chief deserved even severer discipline for his failure to return the alienist to his post of special duty as soon as other doctors were available.

The following statistics of those certified by the marine-hospital medical officers for the years 1900-1906, inclusive, indicate the good results of the employment of alienists for the detection of the mentally unbalanced. Alienists were first employed in 1905.

	1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.	1906.
Insanity.....	28	17	26	21	24	59	122
Idiocy.....	1	5	3	5	13	22	54
Other mental defects.....		25	29	25	20	47	97
Total.....		47	58	51	57	128	273

1906.	
Deported.	Remaining end of year.
113	7
51	3
76	15
240	25

I am convinced, however, after cross-questioning the alienists that a large number of cases slip through because the force is so inadequate for both the detection and examination of defectives. In view of the fact stated to me that the State of New York alone is returning an average of nearly 20 insane persons a month, recently arrived immigrants, it can not be doubted that many insane or mentally defective are admitted.

A building is now in process of construction at Ellis Island to accommodate about twenty-five insane persons. It contains, however, no general examining room and no accommodations for those temporarily detained for observation, nor have plans been drawn to secure such accommodations.

I took pains to visit the State Insane Hospital at Poughkeepsie, the insane hospitals at Wards Island, and the city insane pavilion at Bellevue. The intelligence and efficiency exhibited in the state institutions were in striking contrast to the inefficiency of the government service. Prompt and drastic action should be taken to relieve the Government from disgrace of the present situation, and to that end I offer the accompanying recommendations.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Tuesday, February 1, 1910.

The committee met at 11 o'clock a. m., Hon. Benjamin F. Howell (chairman) presiding, having under consideration House resolution 29. Others present were Representatives Bennet, Sabath, Moore, of Texas, Hayes, Goldfogle, Küstermann, Burnett, and Elvins.

**STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM SULZER, A REPRESENTATIVE
IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK.**

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I desire to call to your attention House resolution 29, introduced by me on January 7, 1910. The object of this resolution is to prevent the separation and deportation, in so far as possible, of members of families of immigrants

coming to the United States. At the present time the immigration officers frequently separate families, allowing some members to land and ordering the deportation of other members. Sometimes they send the husband back, letting the wife and children land; sometimes they send the wife back and let the husband and the children land; sometimes they send back some or all of the children and let the parents land. In many cases where this is done it causes much physical hardship and great mental suffering, frequently causing suicide; and often, when the husband is sent back to places like Russia, he is imprisoned and the families are forever disrupted. Often when children are sent back they lose their identity and never again hear of or see their father or their mother. Frequently when the wife is sent back she never sees her husband or her children again. The physical and mental distress caused by these family separations of immigrants is beyond the imagination. Nobody can picture the sorrows of families separated at the immigration stations. It is a crying evil and should be stopped.

There have been numerous suicides caused by these family separations, and often when the parents go back, as soon as they land on the other side they are clapped in prison and are never heard of again.

The purpose of this resolution must appeal to every humane person who has studied the subject-matter. There is great demand on the part of the people who know about it to have this legislation enacted, and I do not see how there can be any objection to it. In my opinion our laws should be so made that families should not be separated. If a family comes here and the husband is not entitled to land his wife and children should go back with him. There should be no deportation for trivial reasons. Everything should be done to keep the family together. If the husband is entitled to land, and there is some question about whether his wife, or one of his children, is entitled to land, if he is allowed to land, the wife, or the wife and children, should land too. But I say no family should be separated at our gates except for the gravest reasons of public policy.

Outside of the humanitarian aspects of the question, there is an economic phase to it that should appeal to the Members of Congress and to the citizens of the country generally. If the wife is allowed to land and the husband is deported, if they are poor people, the wife is apt to become a burden upon friends or the community. If the husband is allowed to land and the wife is sent back, the chances are that she will not get over here again, and that family is broken up, causing endless sorrow and trouble, and that is what I am trying to prevent, and that is what the people who are behind this bill want to prevent. They want to keep the families intact. There has been too much of these separations in the past. Let us stop it.

The steamship companies that bring over the immigrants seldom have any objection to taking one back, but if we had a law like this bill of mine on the statute books the steamship companies would be more careful and more particular as to the immigrant families that come over, because they would not want to take back the whole family. Hence it would be in the interest of good immigration administration if we passed this bill, and no family would be separated, and no family could be deported except some member of it was suffering from a loathsome or contagious disease.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Do you not except such cases in here?

Mr. SULZER. Yes; I except such cases, and I think they ought to be excepted.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. This provides for an exception of anyone suffering from a loathsome or contagious disease. In that case, of course, the family would be divided.

Mr. SULZER. In that case the family should be sent back—but only in such a case.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Why not have them all return, then?

Mr. SULZER. That is what the bill provides. That the family shall not be separated except in cases where a member is suffering from a loathsome or contagious disease, and then they all go back. I want the law construed liberally in the interest of the family—to keep it together.

Mr. HAYES. Suppose, for example, this case: A man comes here with his family, and his wife or one of his children is insane. You would not think it was a part of wisdom for the United States to admit the insane person, would you?

Mr. SULZER. No. I am willing to include cases of insanity—or, for that matter, criminality.

Mr. HAYES. Or suppose the case that came to my notice the last time I was on Ellis Island. A German family came to this country by the name of Stein, and the oldest boy had a defective heart. His heart beat 120 beats in a minute, twice a second. It was reasonably certain that he would become a public charge. What would you do in such a case as that?

Mr. SULZER. In such a case I would admit the family.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Doubtless the parents were able to provide for him.

Mr. HAYES. They were not.

Mr. SULZER. I would admit all the family.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. They were not then, but they intended to provide for him.

Mr. HAYES. Yes; I know they did.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. That was rather a hardship.

Mr. HAYES. It was very hard. I had my daughter and my niece there, and some other young people, and they shed tears when they found out what the situation was. It was very hard, but still, what are you going to do in such a case?

Mr. SULZER. In a case like that, I should say, if the parents were admitted, the child should be admitted, and the parents would look after the child. I doubt if the child would ever become a public charge.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I did not know that they would be kept out if they were affected with heart disease.

Mr. HAYES. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. How would he become a public charge? Would not that heart trouble cause certain death?

Mr. HAYES. It would cause certain death, or his nerves would all be broken up. He would not be able to do anything.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. He would probably die before long; he could not live long. So I think it is wrong to not let him come in.

Mr. HAYES. I had my sympathies very much wrought up, and I said to Mr. Watchorn, "For Heaven's sake, can't you get this boy a

bond so that he can come in?" I told him I would go his bond myself if there wasn't anyone else to. But he said he could not do it.

STATEMENT OF HON. HENRY M. GOLDFOGLE, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, I have personally known of many cases such as have been referred to by my colleague from New York, Mr. Sulzer. I have seen cases at Ellis Island that have brought misery to many families. I have seen children taken from their parents and deported; fathers taken from children and deported; mothers taken from children, or from some of them, and deported. In some cases there was not that indulgence extended by the immigration authorities that would have been consistent both with justice and mercy. I interested myself in a great many such immigration cases. I was, of course, applied to by hundreds interested as relatives or friends in immigrants who came to the port of New York, for I represent a district largely inhabited by foreign-born people, and it was natural that a great many of my constituents, and many others residing in the city of New York, should apply to me from time to time in behalf of immigrants concerning whose admission question was made. Frequently the department at Washington made directions that operated harshly on the immigrant families. I can go so far as to say that many of these directions worked not alone misery, but cruelty.

There ought to be some legislation whereby the families might not be easily disrupted. I fully recognize the necessity of keeping out the insane, the criminal, and those suffering from loathsome, infectious, and contagious diseases, but there are a thousand and one cases which we can readily conceive of that ought not to give rise to deportation of some of the family while others of them are left here. That works a sad and painful condition. Families should be kept together, if it is at all possible, with due regard to the interests of the country. I am of opinion that this committee should frame such a bill as may tend as much as possible to prevent the hardship, the misery, the cruelty, and the injustice to which both my colleagues from New York and I have this morning referred.

Mr. HAYES. I want to ask Mr. Sulzer if he does not think it would be safer—in fact, I see no other way—where the laws of the United States exclude an alien, to deport the whole family. Otherwise all these exceptions would be absolutely null and void, or nearly so, in the case of the insane, as I suggested, or in the case of one who is sure to become a public charge.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. When you speak of one likely to become a public charge I want to say that is a very elastic term, and it has given rise to a variety of decisions here in Washington, some not consistent with others.

Mr. HAYES. Even so, you would not be in favor of abolishing that provision would you?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I am in favor of so framing legislation that those who really are in actual danger of becoming charges would be excluded. Of course I desire to keep the country free of pauper classes, but I would not have legislation so framed that the department would still be enabled to make rulings that lead to the hardship and the misery,

such as have frequently been made in the past, and to which we have called this committee's attention.

Mr. HAYES. I do not think the Government is to blame for that. It seems to me that the parties who have induced these immigrants to come here are primarily responsible—the steamship companies or their agents.

Mr. BENNET. Let me cite a case to our colleague from California. There was a man came over four or five years ago who went to Albany. He prospered in business, and after he had been here two or three years—I am not certain as to the exact time—he sent over for his wife and 4 children. He was the inducing cause. They came. He met them at Ellis Island. His wife had a slight case of trichina, but the children were all admissible. The board, and subsequently the department, made an order admitting those 4 children and deporting the wife. She very frankly said to the commissioner at Ellis Island, Commissioner Watchorn, "You can put me on the ship and you can start me back, but I will never go. If I have to be separated from my husband and 4 children I will never land on the other side," and he telegraphed to Washington that sooner than execute that order he would resign his office as commissioner. They modified the order and gave him the right to put the wife in the hospital at the expense of her husband, and in time she was cured and the family was reunited. Do you not think he was right?

Mr. HAYES. Certainly he was.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Yes; he was.

Mr. BENNET. Ought there not be some way, some provision, so that at least there could be discretion, in the case of the separation of a family, to prevent it? You told me a case one time, Mr. Hayes.

Mr. HAYES. I told it this morning. It was an awfully touching case.

Mr. BENNET. Do you not think that was almost a brutal hardship?

Mr. HAYES. It was.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I want to say to my colleague from New York that there is a discretion now given by existing law, but I have noted in many communications I have seen, some addressed to me and some to others, that the discretion was not wisely exercised.

Mr. BENNET. Ordinarily there is not very much discretion.

Mr. HAYES. You can not allow very much.

Mr. BENNET. Sometimes it is not advisable. I will give you a case, where a former official was in charge. This was a case of Italians, as I recall it. The father and three children in this country were earning aggregate salaries of \$80 or \$90 a week. The mother and either three or four children came over from Italy on money supplied by the father and the children here from their earnings. The mother was all right and all of the children were admissible, except one. On the neck of a 12 or 13 year old child they found a trace of something which indicated that she might have had tuberculous experience in the past or might some time in the future be afflicted with tubercular trouble, although the doctor said it might never happen, or might not happen in twenty years. On that one scar on the neck of a 13-year-old girl the department here in Washington ordered not only herself deported, but the mother and the other children.

Mr. HAYES. That was silly.

Mr. BENNET. I am very glad to say that I got the order reversed and the family taken off the ship; and the gentleman's successor, without any motion on my part at all, opened up the whole case, admitted all the children except the one with the scar, and the last I heard they were trying to get her admitted, as very possibly they did. The trouble with too rigid laws is this, that some man in office, clothed with a little brief authority, enforces them along the letter, as that man did, and makes a reasonable law obnoxious. He was within the letter of the law.

Mr. HAYES. But not within the spirit of it.

Mr. BENNET. Not at all.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Hayes, how would this do for an amendment to existing law: Suppose we amend the immigration act by saying, "Provided, however, that hereafter no families of immigrants shall be separated except——

Mr. BENNET. You mean all admitted or all excluded?

Mr. SULZER. Yes, practically, save in extreme cases.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. That would work injustice.

Mr. SULZER. Not so much as at present.

Mr. SABATH. Greater hardship than the present.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. It would, for this reason: Suppose there be a family of six and one could not be admitted for a very good and substantial reason, but the others would desire to come in, or the majority of them would desire to come in. Under such a provision you would have to exclude them all and thwart the desires of those who desired to come in, and deport them all.

Mr. SABATH. It may be only a temporary ailment, and they may be sent back. I know of three families that have been sent back on account of children having ringworm, which can be cured within four or five or six months, or sometimes four or five weeks. I know where a mother and two children were separated from the father and three other children and sent back; and I know this also, that every cent they had, everything they had abroad, they sold and disposed of to pay the passage to come over here. What is to become of them when they are all deported? They have no place to go. They have no money to live on. They can not start housekeeping again. What would become of them? I do believe something ought to be done in a measure to right this wrong.

Mr. SULZER. In regard to your suggestion, I was going to say I am satisfied, from my knowledge of the operation of the immigration laws at Ellis Island—and I suppose it is the same at other ports of entry throughout the United States—that if we had a statute like that very few families would ever be sent back. It would have to be an extreme case. In the first place, the steamship companies would be more careful, and then fight to prevent deportation.

Mr. SABATH. We do not want the steamship companies to get in a fight.

Mr. BENNET. In the case of the Italian people, if you have the bill as you propose it, it would not only deport those where the mother and three or four children were brought over, but the father and the children who were here making a success would be deported as aliens.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. And there would be no discretion, and the department at Washington would say, "We are compelled to deport."

Mr. SULZER. We could go further, then, and say "*Provided, however, That no family should be separated and some of its members deported unless they were insane, or criminal, or suffering from a loathsome or contagious disease.*" That would be a good amendment to existing law.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. That is the statute now, practically.

Mr. SULZER. Hardly; if it were, my bill would not be here.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Why not leave the decision to the Secretary of Commerce and Labor? It seems to me there ought to be some one to have the case laid before, and then have it decided according to reason.

Mr. SULZER. The Secretary of Commerce and Labor has decided many such cases. Families have been separated, causing great physical and mental suffering—in some cases suicide, and the families disrupted forever. If our immigration officials were more sympathetic, things would be different in many cases.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Because he was forced to do so under the law, but if you change the law, leaving the decision with him——

Mr. SABATH. My opinion is that under the present law the Secretary of Commerce and Labor has the power to use discretion in some of these cases, but somehow or other, within the last six months or so, there has been no discretion used on his part, nor on the part of anyone under him, and the laws are so strictly construed that it is absolutely impossible for anyone to enter the United States who suffers even slightly with a temporary ailment.

Mr. HAYES. I want to state to Mr. Sulzer, and to all of you, that when there is a contagious disease, for example, in a community, the party who has it is isolated, taken forcibly, if necessary, from his mother and his family, and put in a pesthouse, or some place where that contagion can not be communicated. That is a great hardship, but it is necessary for the protection of the community. We must view this subject in the same light, it seems to me. Whatever is necessary to protect the United States from these evils that the immigration laws try to protect us from, that we must do, even though it works hardship.

Mr. SABATH. I agree with you. I would not appeal for anyone with a loathsome or contagious disease.

Mr. BURNETT. I think another thing about it—that it would open the door and allow a great many other men to get in we don't want to get in, and the perpetration of frauds of that kind. We have to protect ourselves as well as look at the sympathetic side of these questions.

Mr. BENNET. How would this do, Mr. Sulzer, a resolution that in the administration of the immigration laws the Secretary of Commerce and Labor and the boards of special inquiry are directed to avoid, as much as possible, within the law, the breaking up of families? That puts them in a position where, when a case comes before them, they have directions from Congress to avoid the breaking up of families as much as possible, and still leaves them open to enforce the law.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. That does not make definite legislation; it gives no direction; it furnishes no real guide.

Mr. HAYES. The Secretary of Commerce and Labor now has discretion to direct that one who is afflicted with even a loathsome or

contagious disease, if it is curable, in his opinion, shall be detained in a hospital.

Mr. BENNET. He can not do that.

Mr. HAYES. I know that I have been at Ellis Island and I have seen children, as many as a half a dozen at one time, brought from the hospital who have scarlet fever and things of that kind. They detain them and detain the mothers.

Mr. BENNET. They are admitted aliens.

Mr. HAYES. They are as soon as they recover. If they do not recover they are sent back.

Mr. SABATH. They are permitted to be sent to the hospital at the expense of the father or mother.

Mr. BENNET. The steamship company.

Mr. SABATH. It is the father, if he can afford to pay it. I know I myself in one case paid \$90 where they ordered the deportation of a 12-year-old child, where the mother and another child would have been obliged to be deported. They had no funds with which to pay the hospital expense, and I myself paid for three months for that child for his cure in the hospital.

Mr. HAYES. But what I wanted to end up with was this: Is it not true that many of these cases of hardship would be, perhaps, entirely relieved if the Congress of the United States gives to Mr. Williams the appropriation he has asked for to greatly enlarge the hospital facilities at Ellis Island?

Mr. BENNET. The House has already done it.

Mr. SABATH. We have passed that.

Mr. HAYES. I know, but the Senate has not yet.

Mr. SABATH. I would suggest to Mr. Sulzer that he would think this matter over and prepare a bill, instead of this resolution.

Mr. HAYES. Or a joint resolution.

Mr. SABATH. Or a joint resolution, that would relieve the conditions.

Mr. SULZER. Gentlemen, to save time, I ask to have this resolution of mine referred to a committee consisting of Mr. Bennet and Judge Goldfogle, and I will be glad to cooperate with them to get it in shape to accomplish the results desired.

Mr. BENNET. I think you had better make it a larger and different committee. Our sympathies are all the same way in regard to this subject.

Mr. SULZER. I would like to have it referred to a committee of three.

Mr. BURNETT. To do what?

Mr. SULZER. To get the matter in shape to meet the problem we are trying to solve, to prevent breaking up families by deporting some of its members for trivial reasons without rhyme or reason.

Mr. BURNETT. Merely by the introduction of a bill?

Mr. SULZER. I think the best way would be by an amendment to the present immigration laws.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, so that we can have this passed on regularly, I adopt the suggestion made by Mr. Sulzer and move that the matters embraced in the concurrent resolution of Mr. Sulzer be referred to a committee of three for the purpose of considering the matter and reporting back to the committee.

Mr. HAYES. Do you not think in such a small matter we can consider it in the whole committee? We have lots of time.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. We can do that. I have no objection to that, except that the subcommittee could formulate a proper amendment and bring it in to the whole committee.

Mr. BENNET. As I understand, your suggestion was a committee of three appointed by the chair?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Certainly.

Mr. SULZER. Yes; that will do.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you not have the committee named by yourselves? I am perfectly willing that the membership should name the committee.

Mr. HAYES. I do not think I could agree to that proposition as put, because I think that a matter of this great importance should not be submitted to a committee whose ideas are quite as well known as Mr. Goldfogle's and Mr. Bennet's.

Mr. SABATH. The committee would report back to the whole committee.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, I would not invest this committee with any power. I would simply let them sit down and formulate a bill such as Mr. Sulzer suggests.

Mr. HAYES. I do not think your recommendation would have any weight with me, and I think there are others who think the same way.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the full committee should first pass on the question here whether they would adopt the policy, and then, if they do, let it be referred to a special committee to formulate the bill.

Mr. BENNET. Then, as long as we have this special order and have to be out of here at 12, we can take this matter up again at a special meeting.

Mr. SULZER. And I should like to be heard further in the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection that course will be followed.

(Thereupon, at 11.40 o'clock a. m. the committee proceeded to other business.)

H. R. 18377.

The committee, at 11.40 o'clock a. m., took under consideration House bill 18377, "A bill to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States,' approved February 20, 1907."

STATEMENT OF HON. HERBERT PARSONS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

Mr. PARSONS. The object of the bill is to strike out the words "not involving moral turpitude," in the first proviso of section 2 of the immigration act.

Mr. BENNET. Pardon me, but is the provision to which you are going to refer the one on page 3, lines 15, 16, and 17, "*Provided*, That nothing in this act shall exclude, if otherwise admissible, persons convicted of an offense purely political?"

Mr. PARSONS. That is the way the act would read if amended.

Mr. HAYES. How does it read now?

Mr. PARSONS. It reads now, "*Provided*, That nothing in this act shall exclude, if otherwise admissible, persons convicted of an offense

purely political, not involving moral turpitude." The words "offense purely political" constitute an international term. Under international law this Government will not extradite a person accused or convicted of an offense purely political. That is the international law. It is provided for by treaty also. In almost every extradition treaty we have authorized the expression that no one should be extradited because accused or convicted of an offense purely political. For some reason or other there were added on to those words, when the exception was put in the immigration act, the words "not involving moral turpitude." The fact is that almost every offense purely political involves moral turpitude, unless you think that it is warranted because it is a political offense. I will give you some instances.

When the young Turks overthrew the Sultan and marched into Constantinople, they shot a lot of people. Of course, their shooting was mutiny, and under ordinary circumstances it involves moral turpitude. That revolution was successful, however, and no question has arisen. But suppose the revolution had not been successful; then a lot of those soldiers would have been convicted. Supposing some of them had escaped and come to America. Then they would have been admissible on every ground except that they had been convicted of an offense; but it was a political offense, and then the authorities might have said, "Yes, but it is a political offense involving moral turpitude, because they shot somebody."

Another case came to my notice down in Nicaragua. A constituent of mine wrote me complaining that the Estrada people, who had under their control one of the ports on the Atlantic seaboard of Nicaragua, were collecting the customs duties and using them for themselves, and my constituent wanted to know whether he would have to pay the customs duties a second time to Zelaya if Zelaya suppressed the revolution. Supposing Estrada is unsuccessful, then Estrada's collecting the customs duties is robbery, and that is a crime involving moral turpitude. But, under international law, it is a political offense, and the way the act would operate now, supposing some official of Estrada, who had collected these customs duties there, should, after Estrada was unsuccessful, if unsuccessful, be convicted of robbery—it may be a little difficult to suppose that in Nicaragua, but we will suppose it—then came up here and was detained, he would say, "My offense was purely political." The immigration authorities would say, "Well, but it was robbery, and so involves moral turpitude." Under international law, if he got in here he could not be extradited. The difficulty is that he could not get in, under the language as it is now.

Mr. BENNET. If our Revolution had been unsuccessful and they had had a law like this in, say, Germany, and George Washington fled to Germany, having been in charge of what, under those circumstances, would have been rebel troops, would he have been admissible?

Mr. PARSONS. He would have been inadmissible under this provision.

Mr. HAYES. Do the immigration officials interpret the law in that way? I do not think so.

Mr. PARSONS. They have not had any occasion to, because, as a matter of fact, most of the people who get in here who are guilty of these crimes get here before they have been convicted.

Mr. HAYES. I know; but think of all the Polanders in times gone by, the Hungarians, and everybody who has engaged in rebellion, and bloody rebellion, too, how many thousands of them have been admitted here.

Mr. PARSONS. But they had not been convicted before they came. I have a case with which Mr. Sabath and Mr. Goldfogle and Mr. Bennet are familiar, and it was through this case that my attention was called to the matter. I had occasion to defend a Russian revolutionist against extradition, a man by the name of Pouren, and finally succeeded, and there was a similar case in Chicago in which Mr. Sabath was interested. But my attention was called to these words in connection with the case, not that that case involved these words, but the lawyers for whom I was counsel told me that for some reason or other into the act had been incorporated those words "not involving moral turpitude," and they suggested that the law ought to be changed. This man Pouren was engaged in the Lettish revolution in Russia, that is, a revolution in Livland, one of the Baltic provinces, which was an unsuccessful revolution, and he was accused of three series of crimes, murder, arson, and robbery. He admitted some of them, and we showed, by quoting Mr. Fisher's American Revolution, that what the American revolutionists did in the war of the Revolution was just as bad as what Pouren was accused of doing in this Lettish revolution.

Mr. BURNETT. You mean he had been convicted of them?

Mr. PARSONS. No; he had not been convicted of them.

Mr. BURNETT. Then he should not have been excluded.

Mr. PARSONS. Supposing he had been convicted of them and sent to Siberia and then had escaped from Siberia; he might not have been admitted here with those words in there. He was very fortunate in not being extradited, because I believe in his absence a court-martial sat and condemned him to death. I read that in the paper the other day.

For a while these revolutionists were in control of a certain amount of territory in Livland—it was the time of the general revolution in Russia a few years ago—and they were very anxious to close up the grog shops, partly because those were things which were considered privileges of the nobility and partly because people got drunk there and gave away the secrets of the revolutionists; because all the people knew the revolutionists and knew what was going on, and it was only by the universal agreement of secrecy that the government could not find out. So that the revolutionists would go to an inn-keeper who kept a grog shop and say "Close up," and he would generally close. Then the government troops would come along in a few days and say "Open up," and he would. Then the revolutionists would go to him and say "If you open up again, we will fine you," and if he did open up, after the troops went away they would come around and collect a fine. That was one of the charges. Then they said "If you open up again we will burn down your place," and when he opened up again they did burn down his place.

Now, collecting the fine and burning down the place were crimes involving moral turpitude; but they were offenses purely political under the expression as understood in international law and as used in treaties, and the fact that the man would be convicted and then should escape to this country makes him a no less desirable citizen than if he escaped here before he had been convicted.

Mr. BURNETT. Collecting the fine would not be involving moral turpitude.

Mr. PARSONS. It is robbery unless it is justified by revolution.

Mr. HAYES. You do not contend that the case you just stated of the man who had not been convicted, who fled from the revolution, would result in his being excluded under existing law?

Mr. PARSONS. Oh, no; because this proviso only applies to the case of men who have been convicted, but in every one of the cases I have mentioned the men would have been convicted if the revolution had been unsuccessful and if the Government could have gotten hold of them. Those men were no more morally wrong or no more undesirable citizens than were the people who got over here before they were convicted. I was very much interested in this Pouren case. We had a great many witnesses from Massachusetts and New Hampshire, employed in mill towns. They came down to New York and spent a week or ten days there. Although they were poor people, they would not accept any pay for their services—the committee offered them pay—and they were as fine a body of people as I have ever met, and I was glad to think that in escaping from Russia they came over here. I should hate to think that any of those people, if they had been convicted and come over here, would be excluded because of these words in the act.

Mr. HAYES. What I want to find out is, Can you cite us any specific cases where people of that kind have been excluded by the immigration officials?

Mr. SABATH. In both these cases Mr. Parsons states they had been ordered to be extradited, and it was after a hard struggle that took a great deal of time and a large amount of money that all these things were brought out and the men were saved.

Mr. PARSONS. They were not people who had escaped from Russia after having been convicted there.

Mr. ELVINS. Your amendment would reach only those who had broken jail, so to speak?

Mr. PARSONS. Yes.

Mr. ELVINS. Are there any such who get here?

Mr. PARSONS. I do not know, but there are likely to be such.

Mr. HAYES. Let me suggest another question. We will take the case of Zelaya, down here in Nicaragua. Suppose he should apply for admission to the United States and your amendment had been passed; you would have to admit him.

Mr. PARSONS. You would have to admit him at any rate.

Mr. HAYES. No, you would not.

Mr. BENNET. He has not been convicted.

Mr. HAYES. He ought to be. [Laughter.] Instead of narrowing it, I would broaden it to take him in.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Under existing law we would have to exclude Zelaya.

Mr. BENNET. Oh, no.

Mr. BURNETT. Under that law you could admit a man who had made an attempt to dynamite the Emperor.

Mr. PARSONS. Yes; you might.

Mr. SABATH. There is a special section as to that, a special provision.

Mr. PARSONS. I will say this about that, that all the extradition treaties provide that a man who attempts to blow up the Emperor shall be extradited.

Mr. BURNETT. That may be the treaty provision, but the law will absolutely nullify the treaty.

Mr. PARSONS. Oh, no; it will not nullify a treaty.

Mr. BENNET. Yes; a statute supersedes a treaty.

Mr. PARSONS. The right of Russia to extradite a man and punish him there is not affected by your admitting him here, because we are extraditing people all the time who are admitted under the immigration law.

Mr. BURNETT. That may be true as to his extradition, but we are talking about his getting in.

Mr. BENNET. Take that Pouren case, now. Section 2 describes the class of persons who are to be excluded from the United States. You say that since his arrival he has been convicted in his own country of a crime involving moral turpitude.

Mr. PARSONS. I suppose it would be held involving moral turpitude. I have looked up the definition of "moral turpitude," and apparently those words mean anything that is wrong.

Mr. BENNET. Under sections 20 and 21 he may be subject to deportation.

Mr. HAYES. It depends on the immigration official. If he has any sense he will not deport him.

Mr. PARSONS. There was one case last year where three Russians from Siberia escaped and were landed in Alaska, but just what the question was which arose in their case I do not know.

Mr. SABATH. One of them was landed in San Francisco in a barrel. He came over as freight. I know something about the case.

Mr. PARSONS. I knew you would. I am confident that there are a great many people in New York and Chicago at least who are interested in the progressive movements in foreign countries who would like to see this slight amendment made, who probably have not agitated the matter because it has not been called to their attention, but those to whose attention it has been called, I am sure, all feel one way about it. I will be glad to answer any further questions. I thank you, gentlemen.

(Thereupon, at 11.55 o'clock a. m. the committee adjourned.)

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Tuesday, February 8, 1910.

The committee met at 10.30 a. m., Hon. Benjamin F. Howell (chairman) presiding. Others present were Representatives Elvins; Hayes; Edwards, of Kentucky; Burnett; O'Connell; Sabath; Moore, of Texas; Küstermann; Gardner, of Massachusetts; Bennet, of New York; and Johnson, of Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. We will proceed with the hearing.

Mr. HAYES. I ask that Mr. Griffith may be heard by the committee. He is present.

**STATEMENT OF MR. WILLIAM B. GRIFFITH, REPRESENTING
THE STATE COUNCIL, JUNIOR ORDER UNITED AMERICAN
MECHANICS, OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK.**

Mr. GRIFFITH. I represent the State Council Junior Order United American Mechanics, of the State of New York, an association composed of 25,000 voters in that State, being chairman of its legislative committee. At the last session of the state council some immigration resolutions were passed, a copy of which I have here, and which I beg to leave for your consideration.

(The resolutions referred to by Mr. Griffith follow.)

**STATE COUNCIL JUNIOR ORDER UNITED AMERICAN MECHANICS OF THE STATE OF NEW
YORK (INCORPORATED).**

The following resolutions were unanimously adopted at the last session of the state council held in Saratoga Springs, N. Y., September 6 and 7, 1909:

"Whereas the foreign steamships bring to New York City alone more aliens than enter all other countries, as a result of making it the cheapest place to come to; and

"Whereas in consequence of our being made a receptacle for all other countries' surplus and undesirable populations, as shown by the enormous number of alien paupers, insane persons, and criminals in our public institutions, the taxpayers of New York State are shouldered with an annual financial burden of over \$15,000,000, or one-fourth the State's entire expenditures, for the support of foreign-born deficient, dependents, and delinquents; and

"Whereas our existing federal immigration laws are totally inadequate even to secure the deportation of the thousand alien felons now doing service in our state prisons and are mere feeble police regulations; and

"Whereas there is urgent need not only of the vigorous enforcement of the law, but the immediate enactment of additional restrictive measures, in order to prevent the continued increase of the already alarming large number of unemployed, to make it possible to remedy intolerable city congestion, to fortify against a repetition of the recent financial panic, so greatly intensified by the millions of dollars taken and sent abroad by immigrants, the bulk of whom come merely to earn a few hundred dollars, to preserve the time-honored integrity of our public schools, our traditional Sabbath, our other institutions, ideals and very civilization itself, upon which our material, mental, political, social, and whole welfare depends; and

"Whereas recent revelations at Ellis Island show the great need of a more thorough inspection of immigrants, the enlargement and better pay of the officials, the still further increase in facilities and the liberal expenditure of large sums of money there for the better care, treatment, and protective handling of immigrants; and

"Whereas the distribution of immigrants will merely make room for the steamships to dump more, and the finding of employment for foreigners alone is unpatriotic and unjust to our own, native or naturalized, unemployed, and should not be tolerated on the part of the federal division of information and distribution: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, By the State Council Junior Order American Mechanics of New York State in annual convention assembled at Saratoga Springs, this 6th day of September, 1909, that we enthusiastically indorse the patriotic efforts of Commissioner William Williams to more properly enforce the law, earnestly request the abolition of the division of information and distribution, denounce the majority report of the New York State immigration investigating commission as misrepresentative and indorse the minority report, and urge upon Congress the immediate enactment of legislation increasing the steamship head tax, requiring the possession of visible means of support, providing for the deportation of alien paupers, insane, and criminals, excluding alien adults unable to read or write in some European language or dialect, as is required in South Africa, Australia, and other civilized countries, fining the steamships for bringing to this country excludable aliens where the ground for exclusion could have been ascertained by a medical examination or other competent investigation at the time of embarkation, and such other restrictive measures as will tend to prevent us from continuing to be the only country with a considerable net foreign immigration, and in truth the world's dumping ground; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the state legislative committee be instructed to further in every possible way the object and purpose of this resolution; and be it further

“Resolved, That we urge that a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary to each member of the New York Congressional delegation, the Immigration Commission, the House and Senate Immigration Committee; and be it still further

“Resolved, That we urge our state council officials to emphasize this important matter in view of the Immigration Commission’s report and Congressional action next winter, and that the whole matter be brought before the local councils with a view of taking it up with their Congressmen and New York Senators.”

Yours in V., L. and P.,

[SEAL.]

LEWIS F. PAGE,
S. C. Secretary, 1180 Fulton Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Mr. GRIFFITH. The recommendations contained in the resolutions are embodied practically word for word in Mr. Hayes’s bill, House bill 13404. We ask in these resolutions that there should be an increase in the head tax, an illiteracy test, a money requirement, the deportation of all alien paupers, insane and criminals; the abolition of the distribution bureau, additional restrictive legislation, its proper enforcement, and indorse enthusiastically Commissioner William Williams’s appointment and administration at Ellis Island. Under the laws of the State of New York there is compulsory education—our native-born and foreign-born children must go to school. Unless the public-school system is wrong, we feel that as much should be required of aliens as of our own for participation in our industrial and political democracy. The illiteracy test requires nothing more than this: That aliens who are beyond the public-school age when they come to New York should at least have a rudimentary education; that they should at least read and write, if not in a European language, in some European dialect that can be translated and made legible. To be naturalized, an alien must be or ought to be able to read some language and understand English.

We also are in favor of better naturalization laws. As they are at present, you demand that an alien must be able to understand English. We favor requiring him to read and interpret a portion of the Constitution of the United States. Why not keep that man out who can not read a portion of the Constitution of the United States in some language at the time he comes here, if he intends settling in a State where he must be able to do that in order to vote? Is it fair that you should demand that our children must go to school, must be educated up to a certain age, and yet allow those who are older and who are practically illiterate to come in freely from anywhere and everywhere, when we are spending millions of dollars annually on our public schools to banish illiteracy and ignorance from the land?

Mr. BURNETT. Does the State of New York require that before one can be entitled to vote he must be able to read and understand the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. GRIFFITH. I do not believe so; many States north as well as south do. It is difficult for a voter intelligently to vote if he can not read. I believe the naturalization laws are such that a man must understand something of the English language, and that means to be able to read it, in order to become a citizen of the United States.

Mr. SABATH. Are you familiar with the naturalization laws?

Mr. GRIFFITH. Not thoroughly enough to argue the matter in detail.

Mr. SABATH. You do not know then what the provisions are?

Mr. GRIFFITH. Not thoroughly enough without looking them up to argue them minutely. I came prepared merely to present these

immigration resolutions which were passed at our last state session, representing the wishes of 25,000 voters in New York State, and containing their reasons therefor.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. From what body?

Mr. GRIFFITH. The Junior Order United American Mechanics of the State of New York.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Is it not a fact that practically every criminal, or, if not every criminal, a great majority of the criminals, confined within the jails of New York can read and write?

Mr. GRIFFITH. That I can not say.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. We found that so in our State.

Mr. O'CONNELL. It is so practically in all the States, I believe.

STATEMENT OF MR. JAMES H. PATTEN, SECRETARY IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION LEAGUE, BOSTON, MASS., AND CHAIRMAN NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN PURITY FEDERATION.

Mr. PATTEN. According to the census of 1890 and 1900, about 21 per cent of the alien or foreign-born criminals in the prisons and penitentiaries of the States and the United States were unable to read or write in any language.

Mr. SABATH. Could not read or write the English language?

Mr. PATTEN. No, sir; any language. The showing is much worse——

Mr. O'CONNELL. The balance were able to read and write?

Mr. PATTEN. Less than 79 per cent were literate and more than 21 per cent were illiterate.

Mr. SABATH. What is the percentage of the American-born?

Mr. PATTEN. That is all complicated. The percentage of illiterate foreign-born white criminals is twice that of native whites. It all depends on whether you count and how you weight and average the blacks and others as to the native born. There is a large percentage throughout certain districts of the South——

Mr. SABATH. I am not here to say anything against the South or anything against the East. You seem to know the general average of aliens and you are not discriminating; you do not pick out any one nationality. Can you give me now the general average of the American citizens?

Mr. PATTEN. My best recollection is that it is about half, but that is vitiated by the fact that a large percentage of the criminals in the South are illiterate negroes. Age and sex distribution and other qualifying factors are used to interpret and weight the statistical results. As to native-born white criminals, the census of 1890 shows that the illiteracy of the foreign born was double that of the native born.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Is it not a fact that the most notorious and dangerous criminals are the best educated?

Mr. PATTEN. I think that is perfectly true; but they prey upon and use the illiterate as tools—they find the illiterate a more fertile field for——

Mr. O'CONNELL. Who are very well educated?

Mr. PATTEN. That is true, but the illiteracy test, as I said, is not meant as a substitute for our present laws, debarring criminals. It

is proposed merely as an additional selective measure. It would seem that a few intelligent, well-educated criminals even, or anarchists for that matter, are less dangerous to the country than large numbers of men too ignorant to see through their agitations, and forming inflammable material easily kindled into flames of disorder and lawlessness. Then, too, it is not true that the illiteracy test would be valueless as against criminals. For instance, as I said, if the test had been in effect the last half century 21 per cent of the foreign-born criminals in our jails and prisons would not have been admitted. These foreign criminals and, what is of greater importance, their children would not now be here to any extent if an illiteracy test had been enacted years ago, as it was in South African and Australian countries.

Mr. SABATH. I would like to ask where you obtained the figures?

Mr. PATTEN. From the census of 1890 and 1900.

Mr. SABATH. 1890?

Mr. PATTEN. Yes, sir, 1890.

Mr. SABATH. And 1900?

Mr. PATTEN. Yes, sir; I think the same figures are to be obtained from the census of 1900.

Mr. SABATH. Have you them here?

Mr. PATTEN. I can refer you, for instance, to a book written by Prescott F. Hall, where he discusses the point at length. You will find a statement on page 279 of his book entitled "Immigration and its effects upon the United States," published by Henry Holt & Co., New York City.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Prescott F. Hall is writing from your standpoint in behalf of exclusion based on an educational test?

Mr. PATTEN. He is in favor of the illiteracy test and is opposed to leaving the selection of our immigrants entirely to the profit-making choice of the foreign steamship companies.

Mr. O'CONNELL. He is a rabid enthusiast in your cause.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Patten says he has taken the figures from the census.

Mr. PATTEN. I refreshed my recollection yesterday by looking the matter up in Mr. Hall's book. I think I helped him prepare those figures or else verified them. He cites in a footnote a speech by Senator Fairbanks, of Indiana, as an additional authority, I think.

Mr. SABATH. That is what I wanted to show.

Mr. PATTEN. I am positive that the census figures of 1890 show that over one-fifth of our foreign-born criminals are illiterate. As I said a moment ago, the illiteracy test is not proposed as a means of excluding criminals, it is not offered as a substitute for existing laws debarring criminals, but as an additional selective and restrictive measure, and on the ground that, for an enlightened democracy such as we have, on the average, the man who can read and write is more likely to be better fitted for American citizenship than the one who can not. If the steamships can not bring illiterates they will bring literates. Of course an elementary—even a high school—education is no absolute guaranty against rascality. The test is proposed merely as another means of sifting out the more unassimilative aliens. It would seem, as Commissioner-General Sargent argued, that the man who can read, write, and figure must necessarily be better equipped

for the struggle for existence—better prepared for American citizenship, and more likely to take up with our standards and ideals, else our whole public-school system is wrong. There are of course individual cases of illiterate persons making excellent citizens, but statistics show, as one would expect, that it is the illiterate who generally has criminal propensities, is averse to country life, settles down in the crowded quarters, takes no permanent interest in the country, lacks a knowledge of a trade, has lower standards of life, a less ambition to seek a better——

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. He may not have had any chance to learn.

Mr. PATTEN. That is true, but the public-school system, forms of government, and other institutions are reflections of capacities, characteristics, etc., of people——

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. A good many countries do not offer the opportunities that we offer.

Mr. SABATH. How many of those that are employed, we will say, in building the railroads and in the mines can read and write? It is not absolutely necessary that a man should be a scholar, is it, to develop our country, to develop our farms, and to build our railroads?

Mr. PATTEN. I should not say it were an absolute necessity. My best recollection is that Mr. Campbell, of the Department of Commerce and Labor, stated before the House committee in 1906 that he thought a rudimentary education was undesirable among our working people. But, on the other hand, the late Commissioner-General of Immigration, Mr. Frank P. Sargent, in one of his annual reports, expressed a decidedly contrary opinion and argued that a rudimentary education certainly could not be a handicap in the struggle for existence, and the inference I drew from his statements was that it was decidedly desirable, and that our public-school system was all right.

Mr. SABATH. I agree with him, of course.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Patten stated that it could be demonstrated from the report of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor that the head tax was not paying the expenses of the service. What the Secretary of Commerce and Labor said is this, on page 11 of his report for 1909:

While the Immigration Service is assuming very large proportions and the expense is running into considerable figures, it is well to remember that the protection and fair treatment of human beings is one of its purposes, and that the head tax paid by the immigrants themselves still exceeds the cost of the entire immigration and naturalization services.

Mr. Patten also stated that the head tax was not being collected, and I desire to insert in the record a letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce and Labor, stating that that is not true.

Mr. PATTEN. I have the figures and official reports upon which I relied for my information, which bear out my statements.

Mr. HAYES. I have proof that that is so.

Mr. SABATH. If it is not being collected, I am willing that we should amend that section.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Why are they not collected?

Mr. HAYES. Because of instructions and regulations issued by Secretary Straus.

Mr. BENNET. I will read this letter:

FEBRUARY 7, 1910.

Hon. WILLIAM S. BENNET, M. C.,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BENNET: In response to your letter of the 6th instant, in regard to a statement made before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to the effect that head tax is not being collected on account of aliens who have previously resided in the United States (nonimmigrant aliens), I desire to advise you that head tax is collected on account of all aliens entering the United States, with the exception of those coming within the classes specifically enumerated in rules 1, 40, and 41, reference being made to pages 26, 27, 28, 64, and 65 of the inclosed pamphlet.

Those are the exceptions under the law.

Mr. HAYES. They are not all by law.

Mr. BENNET. I will read them. It is not his construction. [Reads:]

RULE 2. *Exemptions from head tax.*—The head tax shall not be levied in respect of the following aliens:

(a) Aliens who do not enter the United States because excluded from admission thereto by the immigration act. (Secs. 1 and 2.)

(b) Diplomatic and consular officers and other accredited officials of foreign governments, their suites, families, and guests coming to the United States to reside or to pass through in transit. (Sec. 41.)

(c) Head tax shall not be collected on account of aliens entering the United States from Canada, Newfoundland, Cuba, or Mexico whose legal domicile or bona fide residence was in one of the countries specified for at least one year immediately preceding such entrance if it merely appears that the continuity of their physical presence at their place of residence or domicile was broken by one or more transient and temporary departures therefrom; nor shall head tax be collected on account of such aliens if it merely appears that, instead of entering the United States from Canada, Newfoundland, Cuba, or Mexico directly, they come by way of some other foreign country in which they had made a merely temporary or transient sojourn.

(d) Head tax shall not be collected on account of aliens reentering the United States from Canada, Newfoundland, Cuba, or Mexico who are citizens thereof but who have acquired a legal domicile or bona fide residence in the United States, and who are returning from a visit to one of the said countries, notwithstanding that the period of a full year has not intervened between the date of their departure from and the date of their return to the United States.

Mr. HAYES. That is not in the law, but it seems to be a reasonable provision.

Mr. BENNET. It is practically based on the statute.

Mr. HAYES. There is no law for that.

Mr. BENNET. (Reads:)

(e) Aliens, otherwise admissible, who are residents of any possession of the United States, provided at the time of admission to such possession head tax was paid on their account. (Sec. 1.)

(f) Aliens who enter the United States only for the purpose of transit to foreign destinations. Collections made in respect of such aliens will be held on special deposit and will be refunded pursuant to Rules 1 and 41. (Sec. 1.)

(g) Aliens who have been lawfully admitted to the United States and who later shall go in transit from one part of the United States to another through foreign contiguous territory. Satisfactory evidence of such previous lawful admission and of previous payment of head tax shall be required in the case of aliens on whose behalf this exemption is claimed, as in paragraphs (c) and (d) of this rule. Personal knowledge on the part of an immigration officer, or a written statement from such an officer based on an examination of official records certifying to the fact of previous entry and payment of tax, will be sufficient. As evidence of the continuity of the transit, production of a dated passenger ticket, where such exists, may be required. (Sec. 1.)

(h) Aliens arriving in Guam, Porto Rico, or Hawaii; but if any such alien, not having become a citizen of the United States, shall later arrive at any port or place of the United States on the North American continent the provisions for the levy and collection of head tax shall apply. (Sec. 1.)

Mr. HAYES. Not one is provided by law.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Bennet is a member of the committee and we can hear from him at any time. I see a great many gentlemen here who likely desire to be heard, and I think we should give them a chance.

Mr. SULZER. I have to go to another committee meeting, and if the committee will pardon me I simply desire to say that I want to be heard in opposition to Mr. Hayes's bill. I would like to have the clerk make a memorandum of that fact, and if he will notify me I will come at any time. I see you have all you can do this morning, and so I will not take up any more of your time, because I am a very busy man.

Mr. BENNET. Rules 40 and 41 refer to aliens in transit who are specifically exempted and excepted by the statute. [Reads:]

RULE 40. *Aliens in transit.*—Every alien seeking a landing for the purpose of proceeding directly through the United States to a foreign country shall be examined, and, if found to be a member of any one of the excluded classes, shall be refused permission to land, in the same manner as though he intended to remain in the United States. Cases where a refusal of the privilege would entail exceptional hardship may be reported to the Secretary for a special ruling.

RULE 41. *Aliens in transit, head tax for.*—(a) No alien desiring admission at a port of the United States for the professed purpose of proceeding directly therefrom to foreign territory shall be permitted to land thereat except after deposit with the collector of customs at said port, by the master or owner of the vessel or by a representative of any other mode of transportation by which such alien is brought, of the amount of the head tax (\$4) prescribed by section 1 of the immigration act, said amount to be refunded upon proof satisfactory to the immigration officer in charge at the port of arrival that said alien has passed by direct and continuous journey through and out of the United States within thirty days from the date of admission, proof of such departure to be furnished within sixty days from the date of admission. Special deposits of head tax on account of aliens in transit will, at the expiration of sixty days from the date of admission, be covered into the Treasury as head tax, the cases in which proof of departure is received after the expiration of such period to be reported to the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization for special authorization, under the provision incorporated in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved February 3, 1905.

(b) All aliens of the taxable class desiring to proceed in transit through the United States from the Dominion of Canada shall be required to furnish to the examining officer or officers guaranty of payment of head tax described in paragraph (k) of rule 25 of these regulations. If admissible, aliens claiming to be in transit will be given certificate Form 523, providing for refund of head tax upon such certificate being properly indorsed by the alien and by the purser of the outgoing trans-Atlantic or trans-Pacific steamship upon which the holder of said certificate may depart from the United States; or, if the alien be passing in transit through the United States from one point in Canada to another point in Canada, then such indorsement to be made by the conductor of the train upon which the holder of the certificate departs from the United States.

(c) Refund of head tax will be made on aliens of the taxable class arriving at Atlantic or Pacific ports of Canada and desiring to proceed immediately in transit through the United States to the transportation line responsible for payment of head tax on such aliens, upon proof satisfactory to the United States commissioner of immigration for Canada that said aliens have passed by direct and continuous journey through and out of the United States within the time limit specified in this rule.

(d) Even though an alien, being a "transit passenger," enters and leaves the United States at the same port the provisions of this rule shall be applied to his case to the same extent, and in the same manner so far as necessary as though such alien entered at one port and departed through another. In the cases of those entering across the Canadian border as transient visitors, however, Form No. 569 will be used instead of Form No. 523, under the procedure laid down in paragraph (b) hereof.

(e) A class of "transit passengers" which requires somewhat different treatment in practice than "transits" as ordinarily understood and "transient visitors," whose cases are covered by the preceding paragraphs hereof, consists of aliens visiting the United States as tourists, on pleasure or business. With regard to such class, no payment or deposit of head tax need be required if the immigration officers at the port of entry are satisfied that it is the bona fide intent of the passenger merely to visit or tour the United States. For instance, when an alien is in possession of first-class round trip or through transportation, or other circumstances are present indicating with reasonable certainty that the passenger is a tourist, deposit should not be required; if doubt exists, he should be classed as a "transit" or "transient visitor."

Mr. HAYES. There is absolutely no statutory authority for exempting "transient" aliens, as is done by (E) of No. 41 of the Straus rules. I am advised by those familiar with the situation that under the ruling of the previous Secretary of Commerce and Labor [Mr. Straus] aliens who have heretofore been admitted to the United States are not even inspected—were not in 1908. The Secretary simply tried by his rules and regulations, as he did by his decisions, No. 116, for instance, to construe the statutory phrases "aliens" and "every alien" into "immigrant alien" and "aliens leaving a foreign permanent domicile and intending to reside in this country," which opens up the way to all sorts of frauds and defrauding of the Government.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Those aliens, in the first place, have already paid their head tax.

Mr. HAYES. I do not care about that.

Mr. O'CONNELL. You would not have them pay it again?

Mr. HAYES. They should be inspected. The immigration officers do not do their duty if they do not inspect them.

Mr. O'CONNELL. I think you are mistaken. From my experience in Boston I think they are making the necessary inspection.

Mr. BENNET. On February 22, 1909, the House of Representatives made an inquiry of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor in regard to this matter, and on February 25, 1909, the Secretary of Commerce and Labor replied in an official document in which he covered the whole matter. During the preceding year 14 aliens were allowed to enter this country solely because of a satisfactorily established claim of theretofore acquired permanent domicile; that during the same period 6 aliens who were otherwise inadmissible were admitted upon a satisfactorily established claim of domicile, making a total of 20, and the action in those cases was based not on any rule, but on three or four decisions of the circuit court of appeals in different parts of the United States, all of which are to the effect that a foreigner who seeks readmission to this country to resume a formerly acquired and unrelinquished domicile is not an alien within the meaning of the immigration law.

Mr. HAYES. If you put in any evidence, I want to put in something to show the contrary.

Mr. BENNET. I think that is right.

Mr. PATTEN. May I be heard on those points. First, in regard to whether the "head-tax receipts" exceed all the immigration service disbursements. If you take the disbursements and receipts of the immigrant fund for the years 1907 and 1908 they will show that the disbursements exceeded the receipts for those two years by about \$2,000,000. If you take them for 1908—at the beginning of that fiscal year—on July 1, the balance in the immigrant fund was over \$3,000,000 and by the end of that fiscal year it dwindled to about \$500,000. The immigrant fund started the fiscal year of 1908 with a balance of over \$3,000,000 and it wound it up with a balance of only \$555,000. It may have been that some items were carried over from 1907, but those would have made 1907 all the worse. Now, take last year——

Mr. HAYES. That is, the fiscal year 1909?

Mr. PATTEN. Yes, sir; ending June 30, 1909. I have here the Seventh Annual Report of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor.

Mr. BURNETT. For what year?

Mr. PATTEN. 1909.

Mr. BURNETT. The fiscal year ending June 30, 1909?

Mr. PATTEN. Yes, sir. On pages 72 and 73 you will find the items to which I referred when before this committee two weeks ago. I stated then that all aliens, immigrants and nonimmigrants—I included both—that “all aliens” did not pay the \$4 tax. I stated merely that each and every alien entering the country did not pay the tax, which the Secretary’s letter admits, and the quoted rules show. On page 73 we find that the receipts from the \$4 tax for the year 1909 were \$3,243,220. Now, admitting that some of the steamship companies do not pay all that is due promptly—but that is a common factor for each year, about as much being carried over from one as from the next—you will find that if you divide that amount by 4 that the tax was paid on only 810,805 aliens for 1909, when, as a matter of fact, 944,235 entered the country, leaving a difference of 133,430, for whom, according to these figures, the steamships did not pay the \$4 tax.

Mr. O’CONNELL. Are not they expressly exempt by law?

Mr. PATTEN. Some are. I did not say there were no exemptions. I made no such statement as that. You must multiply the total number of aliens by \$4. Nine hundred and forty-four thousand two hundred and thirty-five aliens came. That would amount to \$3,776,940, if the steamships paid \$4 for every alien. Some are exempt by statute and some through the administration and construction of the law, where there is no specific exempting provision. I did not say or mean to convey, and feel certain I did not convey, the idea that no aliens were exempt. I did not mean to misrepresent the facts, and I do not believe I did, if my statement is taken word for word and fairly construed. As to this particular point, if you take the annual report, the official statistics, you will find that the balance of \$3,000,000 at the beginning of the year 1908 was reduced during the year, in spite of the receipts, to \$555,000. One million six hundred and fifty thousand dollars ought to have been paid into that fund which was not. But that, even, leaves a big difference for that year on the deficit side of almost \$1,000,000.

Mr. BENNET. I can state the reason for that. In that year they changed their method of bookkeeping.

Mr. PATTEN. I took the two fiscal years of 1907 and 1908 together and showed that the disbursements had exceeded the receipts, so as to cover any such explanation. The balance on hand in the immigrant fund at the beginning of the fiscal year of 1907 was about \$2,500,000. The balance on hand at the close of the fiscal year of 1908 was only \$550,917.04, which shows there was a large excess of disbursements over receipts.

Mr. BENNET. The figures of the preceding years are not at all important, because the head tax was increased and is now double what it was, but they have changed the method of bookkeeping, and for the first time they have charged up against the balance special appropriations not heretofore deducted, \$1,259,529.13, and they have then charged up amounts appropriated and not expended as follows:

Appropriation, "Enforcement of the Chinese-exclusion act," 1908.....	\$500,000.00
Appropriation, "Immigrant station, Charleston, S. C.".....	70,000.00
Appropriation, "Immigrant station, Galveston, Tex.".....	70,000.00
Appropriation, "Immigrant station, New Orleans, La.".....	70,000.00
Appropriation, "Immigrant station, Philadelphia, Pa.".....	250,000.00
Reimbursement, Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service.....	150,000.00
Addition to old hospital building, Ellis Island.....	250,000.00
Additional buildings contagious-disease hospital, Ellis Island.....	150,000.00
New water main, Ellis Island.....	18,000.00
Mechanical equipment, contagious-disease hospital, Ellis Island.....	115,000.00
Immigration Commission.....	75,677.14

Amount of special appropriations to be reimbursed from the
 "immigrant fund"..... 1,718,677.14

or a total of over \$3,000,000 charged against the fund by a change in the method of bookkeeping.

Mr. O'CONNELL. I think this observation should be made—that all those expenditures are for permanent improvements and not merely for the continuing expenses, but they are making property for the Government.

Mr. BENNET. They are proper charges against the head tax. They are charged up here not as matters that have been spent, but matters appropriated and which will be spent some time in years to come.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Exactly; that is my point.

Mr. SABATH. Five hundred thousand dollars for the enforcement of the Chinese-exclusion act is taken also from this immigrant fund?

Mr. BENNET. Always.

Mr. SABATH. They in no way contribute anything toward the fund.

Mr. HAYES. They pay the tax.

Mr. SABATH. We do not permit any Chinese to land.

Mr. HAYES. Oh, we do.

Mr. SABATH. That \$500,000 would come out of the General Treasury if it were not for the head tax, so we help to spend in California \$500,000.

Mr. HAYES. Not only in California, but anywhere on the borders.

Mr. BENNET. That report, as Mr. Patten knows, does not show money that is spent, but simply shows charges which will come against the fund, that the balance of \$550,917.04 on June 30, 1908, was not the balance at the close of the year, but would be the balance if every cent appropriated had been spent during that year, which, of course, was not.

Mr. PATTEN. The balance in the fund was reduced that year from three millions to half a million dollars. There was need of its expenditure and more, too, I think. It should also be stated that there was not half enough appropriated for most of the purposes, whether spent or not spent—it ought to have been, in my humble opinion. If the committee will permit the expression, I think much more ought to have been appropriated for every one of those stations. That the \$250,000 has not been spent in Philadelphia is no fault of the Government. Philadelphia seems to want the station, but not the immigrants. Conditions at all the stations are far from adequate. Immigrants at Boston, for instance, are detained on Long Wharf in a wooden structure which is a reproach to this Government. The detention quarters at Ellis Island, as the gentleman from New York knows, where from 800 to 1,200 detained aliens have to be crowded into a little room not over 60 feet by 150 feet, are simply a disgrace. I stopped over and

visited that room a few days ago on my way back here, and it is indeed "a reproach," as Commissioner Williams says, in his last annual report, "to this Government." In my humble opinion the appropriation in the recent urgent deficiency bill should have been larger than the \$90,000 which it carried in order to meet the immediate needs of the service at Ellis Island.

Mr. SABATH. I agree with you as to the conditions at Ellis Island.

Mr. PATTEN. At practically all the other ports the immigrants are examined on the docks of the steamships, detained in rented quarters or those furnished by the steamships, and lack even suitable and safe detention rooms, to say nothing of hospitals and other needed facilities. Long wharf at Boston is inadequate and unsafe, and the proposed station ought to have been started and the appropriation and more too spent long since.

Mr. O'CONNELL. The only reason why the accommodations at Boston are not adequate is because of lack of modern requirements for the building. It is a wooden structure on a wooden wharf and that is the element of danger, but on the other hand there is nothing disgraceful about it.

Mr. PATTEN. It is a reproach to the Government, and if a fire should break out there would be a repetition of the Ellis Island fire, or something in the nature of the *General Slocum* disaster, that would call forth the severest kind of criticism.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Very few are detained there, as a matter of fact.

Mr. BENNET. I asked Commissioner Williams yesterday if they had ever asked for a single dollar for Ellis Island that they did not get. He said they never had. As a matter of fact, since I have been in Congress in the last four years, not one single request has come from Ellis Island for money that they have not been given, and this information four years ago from James Bronson Reynolds, every single complaint of that kind that the department has asked Congress to remove has been removed. Only the other day, in response to the request that Commissioner Williams made, the House appropriated every dollar he asked for.

Mr. PATTEN. I will say that the report of Mr. Reynolds three years ago last November was simply and solely as to the treatment and care of the insane and mentally defective at Ellis Island, and Mr. Watchorn in his report to the department in answer to Mr. Reynolds's criticism said that he had repeatedly asked for an appropriation and that Congress had not made it. That was his reason for the maintenance of the scandalous conditions which Mr. Reynolds found. He said that he had asked for an appropriation and had not changed those awful conditions because of the failure of Congress to make the necessary appropriation. That is a matter of record at the department. With regard to Mr. Reynolds's whole report on the treatment and care of the insane and mentally defective at Ellis Island, which was largely if not solely concerned with a certain detention room there, I would say that, according to Commissioner Williams's last annual report, the conditions have not been fully remedied, for he complains:

Certain wooden barracks are now used for this purpose. They were never intended to stand permanently, and furthermore are dangerous by reason of their inflammability.

Those are the conditions that have not been removed, and they should have been over three years ago.

Now, as to the question whether last year's disbursements exceeded the receipts. The department prophesied before the House appropriation subcommittee a deficit of \$600,000. Take the figures to be found on page 72 of the Seventh (1909) Annual Report of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor. These show that the direct disbursements of the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization for the past fiscal year were \$3,564,769.71. On the opposite page you will find that the "head-tax receipts" were \$3,243,220. According to those figures the disbursements exceeded "head tax receipts" by \$321,549.71. From that, in order to ascertain whether all expenditures exceed all receipts, must be deducted "receipts" from "exclusive privileges at immigrant stations," \$14,016; and naturalization fees, \$186,516.75. Such deductions leave a difference or excess of debits over credits of \$121,016.96. If you should add to that, as should be added, the item on page 73, "By the special disbursing agents of the Immigration Service, \$46,636.21," you would have an excess of disbursements over receipts for 1908 of \$167,653.17. It is true that all the appropriation for the enforcement of the Chinese exclusion act was not spent and some of it reverted, but it should have been and much more, too, if that act is to be properly enforced, as Mr. Hayes knows. Not only that, but there should be added a number of indirect expenses of about four or five hundred thousand dollars that are not charged up at all to the Immigration Service, such as certain expenses of the Department of Justice, part of the Secretary's salary, traveling and office expenses, and one thing and another, which would completely offset any and all possible explanations, in my opinion. Then, too, a good-sized appropriation for special work in enforcing the contract labor and other provisions of our immigration laws, as well as the passenger act, seems sorely needed in view of the Immigration Commission's findings.

Mr. SABATH. Does the report show what the expenditures were, including all these appropriations for buildings?

Mr. HAYES. Not for last year.

Mr. BENNET. \$862,602.37 for Ellis Island and \$10,000 at Galveston.

Mr. HAYES. No new buildings?

Mr. BENNET. That was charged up twice in their bookkeeping. They charged it up the year before and this year they charged it again as they spent it. They charged \$431,815.15 for the enforcement of the Chinese exclusion act.

Mr. PATTEN. That is not a second charge——

Mr. BENNET. That is an annual appropriation. It was charged up the year before.

Mr. HAYES. That does not affect the last year.

Mr. BENNET. What Mr. Patten is trying to show is that there was a deficit in 1908, by charging up everything that had been appropriated. Now he is attempting to show that they spent the money again and that there is a deficit in 1909.

Mr. HAYES. He is using the statements of the Department of Commerce and Labor. If they are guilty of any such bookkeeping as you say, I think they need an expert bookkeeper.

Mr. BENNET. That may be; I am not defending them.

Mr. PATTEN. These are simply direct expenditures, and if you also take into consideration the legitimate indirect expenditures, I think you can show an excess of expenditures over receipts, although I did not go quite that far in my statement two weeks ago. The Secretary

considers this bureau the most important of his work, I understand, and if that is true, as it certainly seems to be, a major portion of his salary and expenses should be charged up to the Immigration Service account. There are other indirect expenditures of the same kind that should be included. Then, too, in previous years, from time to time, I believe the Government has appropriated directly and indirectly large sums for the Immigration Service, and if these were included in a statement, the indirect expenditures as well as the direct expenditures, even, for any one or two years, it is my opinion, judging from what I can find out from these officially published reports, that as a rule the so-called "head-tax receipts" do not pay the total expenses of the Immigration Service. That was all I meant to conclude or argue at most. It is a matter on which the Secretary or his representative can express a much more authoritative opinion, of course, with their inside knowledge of the premises.

Mr. BURNETT. You mean the expenses of the Commissioner-General and the clerical force in his office?

Mr. PATTEN. As I understand, the salary of the Commissioner-General and the expenses of his office, but not the secretary's salary or any of his office expenses, are charged up to the Immigration Service. I do not believe that his traveling expenses on immigration matters are so charged. I do not believe a part of the department's printing plant expenses either are charged up, although it does much printing for the bureau. There are a number of other indirect expenses in this and other departments which would run into the hundreds of thousands of dollars, I should think, that ought to be properly included as immigration expenditures, in order to reach accurately the excess of debits over credits.

Mr. BURNETT. The immigration fund is covered into the General Treasury now?

Mr. PATTEN. Yes, sir; since July 1 last, and Chairman Tawney said on the 24th of last month again, as he said then—I have here a copy of the Congressional Record—that the reason why the immigrant fund was abolished was owing to an approaching balance in red figures—a deficit.

Mr. BENNET. It is true there was a limitation of \$2,500,000 on the head tax, but there was a surplus of \$880,000 for that fiscal year.

Mr. HAYES. What year?

Mr. BENNET. For the time up to when the amendment was put on the sundry civil bill last year. They did put a limitation on the bill.

Mr. PATTEN. Take, for instance, the two years of 1907 and 1908. There was on hand July 1, 1908, a balance, as I said, of \$3,079,515.26 in the immigrant fund, and by the close of that fiscal year it had fallen to only \$550,917.04. If you take the two years of 1907 and 1908, as I said a while ago, so as to eliminate the bookkeeping explanation, you will find that the disbursements exceeded the receipts by about \$2,000,000. For the year 1908 the disbursements from the immigrant fund exceeded its receipts by \$2,528,598.22. For that year the actual excess of disbursements over actual receipts was \$928,967.94, according to the official published figures, if no attention is paid to the "covering limitation," which allowed only \$2,500,000 of the \$3,300,000 "total" receipts to be credited to the immigrant fund.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. You, as the paid agent of the Immigration Restriction League, seem to be very anxious to have immigrants have proper accommodations and quarters, while the purpose of your league is to exclude them as much as possible and to make it unnecessary to have any immigrant stations?

Mr. PATTEN. I beg pardon, but the object of the Immigration Restriction League and of the American Purity Federation is not exclusion, except as to 'undesirables.' Each stands for certain exclusions and restrictions, but neither is opposed to immigration per se. I do not believe an increase in the "head tax," or rather steamship per capita tax, to \$10 would increase the steerage rates, and consequently I do not believe there is a bit of restriction even in it. I think as Mr. Gardner, of this committee, has ably argued in the House, that it would have to be put up to \$25 or \$50 in order to compel the steamship companies to charge as much or more to this country than they charge to other countries to which they are running and thus materially affect the number coming here. The present rates are from \$5 to \$65 less than to South America and South Australia. I have considerable data from the steamship companies on that point, and feel quite certain of my conclusions. Now, in order to restrict you would have to make the steamship tax \$40 or \$50, in my opinion, before the transportation companies which are now charging "all the traffic will bear," would raise their rates sufficiently to deter any number of immigrants from coming.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. You want to go step by step and eventually reach that point?

Mr. PATTEN. That is not the controlling idea or motive with me or the public-spirited organizations I represent, I am sure; and if I could show you the minutes of the meetings of the executive committees, you would find that they have never advocated this increased tax for that purpose whatever the members may think individually or the organizations may do after the illiteracy test becomes a law. The most selective and restrictive measure which the Immigration Restriction League of Boston and the Purity Federation have advocated has been the illiteracy test. I do not believe you can find in their private records or public utterances or in their pamphlets anything to the contrary——

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I should like to refer to one of the pamphlets issued by the League wherein it is stated that the reason so few children were found in American families was simply because they did not want those poor children, if born, exposed to the children of the immigrants, that they do not want them to come together. That is the spirit of your League?

Mr. PATTEN. I beg pardon, Mr. Küstermann, I think if you will look at that pamphlet you will find that that is an article or quotation from an author of international reputation, the late Gen. Francis A. Walker, president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the chief of two United States censuses, who made a very close and thorough statistical study of the question.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. They were very anxious to quote it. I do not care who said it, they had it in their own pamphlet.

Mr. PATTEN. You will remember that the investigations of the industrial commission bore out General Walker's conclusions; for it concluded: "It is a hasty assumption which holds that immigration

during the nineteenth century has increased the total population" of the United States. (Vol. XV, p. 277.) The point being that recent foreign immigration has been a substitution for rather than an addition to our population, in the manner in which your statement indicated. Census statistics show that the population of the South has increased faster out of its own loins alone than has the population of the North out of its loins and from foreign immigration, both together.

Mr. SABATH. You are referring to the colored population of the South?

Mr. PATTEN. I am referring to the population of the South, either or both, colored and uncolored.

Mr. SABATH. Just put in the word "colored."

Mr. PATTEN. You can take it either white or black, or both. I think the census will show that the average increase in the native birth rate in the South has been about 30 per cent per decade, whereas in the North it has fallen off to almost nothing, as Walker and the industrial commission point out exclusively in the very States, counties, and localities where recent foreign immigration has competed. There is, for instance, no place in this country where you will find so many old maids, bachelors, late marriages, small families, and so much "race suicide" as you will find in the very towns and communities of the Northeast to which is destined fully 90 per cent of the present influx. I am speaking of the masses, and not of the so-called "flower of society" which is small and dies off everywhere.

There are a number of factors, but the cause of causes, for many reasons, is the enormous inflow and efflux of aliens with lower standards and different ideals. It is the character of the present immigration, the fact that about three-fourths are unmarried male adults, that the bulk comes without any visible means of support, ignorant of our conditions, lacking a knowledge of our language, illiterate, and unused to self-government and self-care; for instance, last year one-fourth of those coming did not have money enough to prepay their passage to this country, and almost one-third of the adults could not read and write. They were unable to speak our language. Less than 10 per cent of them had ever been here before. They were unacquainted with our conditions, and had to find some kind of work at almost any wage, and thus in certain northeast labor centers subjected workers to a cutthroat, ruinous competition, which seems to need protection. They come as birds of passage, about half of those who came have gone back during the last ten years, and have gone back with large savings—"Grasshopper immigrants," Editor John Temple Graves calls them,——

Mr. BENNET. Half have gone back?

Mr. PATTEN. Yes; about half, perhaps I should have said. Thirty-five or 40 per cent, to be accurate.

Mr. O'CONNELL. You are away off.

Mr. SABATH. You are mistaken when you state that they come here without a cent in their pockets. The fact is that a direct order has been issued by the Immigration Commissioner which precludes anyone entering the United States unless he has at least \$25 of his own money on his person, and I know that the average must be fully \$50.

Mr. BENNET. Do you mean that they have gone back to remain permanently?

Mr. PATTEN. Did I use the word "permanently?"

Mr. BENNET. Yes, sir.

Mr. PATTEN. I do not believe the record will show that I did. I said that half have gone back with their savings. Immigrants are admitted every day now, and have been, under Commissioner Williams, without anything like \$25 in hand, provided they are not likely to become public charges——

Mr. BENNET. Forty per cent of them have gone back.

Mr. PATTEN. That was my point. I will give you the figures. The total alien arrivals for the past ten years have been 8,515,889 and the total departures have been 3,275,589. according to the annual reports of the Commissioner-General of Immigration.

Mr. BENNET. Those are the figures from the steamship companies; they are not from the official reports?

Mr. PATTEN. I took them from the Annual Report of the Commissioner-General, an official government publication. I do not think I misstate the facts, Mr. Bennet.

Mr. JOHNSON. Why do they go back?

Mr. O'CONNELL. They go away in the winter time and come back in the spring.

Mr. SABATH. They go back because there is no employment. The moment they think there will be no employment or no work, they leave.

Mr. JOHNSON. They simply come here and take up the work of our people and when our people have not the work they go back?

Mr. SABATH. No; I did not mean to say that at all. They come here to assist and to do the real hard work that a great many of our own laboring men will not do.

Mr. EDWARDS. Does not their coming here in effect force our people to work at a less wage?

Mr. SABATH. No; I will tell you why. You take the places in the United States where the immigrant lands and where he goes and you will find that the price of wages is higher usually than at the places in the United States where the immigrant never goes.

Mr. EDWARDS. Is not that explained by the fact that the places where they land are the great cities, where the cost of living and wages generally and all expenses are much higher?

Mr. SABATH. They do not go to the great cities alone. They enter New York, Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Boston, but they do not remain there. They go all over the country.

Mr. HAYES. Seventy-five per cent of them remain there.

Mr. SABATH. If 75 per cent of the people who landed in New York remained there, the city of New York to-day would have 15,000,000 people.

Mr. HAYES. I mean they land in New York and go to Chicago or Pittsburg or some other great city, or return to their native lands with their savings.

Mr. SABATH. You will find that not more than 25 per cent of the immigrants reside in the large cities, like New York, Chicago, or Pittsburg. If they do come there, they remain only a short time, and then go farther west.

Mr. EDWARDS. Would it not be fairer to state that when the immigrant lands in New York City or any other large city he goes where

wages are higher, than to state that where the immigrant is the wages are higher?

Mr. SABATH. No, sir; I think he goes where he is needed.

Mr. EDWARDS. And where they need him they pay a big price?

Mr. SABATH. They work on the railroads; that is, building the tracks. The hardest work in this country is being done by the immigrants. You go into the mines and in the lumber camps, all the real hard work is done by the immigrants, and the same in the mills, the dangerous work.

Mr. EDWARDS. There is plenty of American labor to do that work.

Mr. O'CONNELL. They will not do it.

Mr. SABATH. I do not think they compete with the American labor. I think they advance the American laborer. That is my sincere opinion.

Mr. EDWARDS. Perhaps our laboring people will not do the work at the prices that they will do it, but is there any reason why an American laborer who works in the tunnels and on the railroads should not have compensation by which he can live a decent, respectable life and educate his children, the same as a professional man or a business man?

Mr. SABATH. There is no one in this room who is more anxious and more desirous to obtain the highest possible wages for our laboring men and to better their condition than I am.

Mr. EDWARDS. Do you think you can do that by admitting these people who have not had the advantages and who do not appreciate the advantages that the American workingmen have and who are willing to work for less wages than they are?

Mr. SABATH. They are not willing to work for less wages. You will find that the foreigner who comes here, as a rule, joins the union as soon as he gets an opportunity, and the union to-day, more than anything else, is responsible for the wages that the laboring man is receiving.

Mr. GARDNER. Have we not some witness here, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. PATTEN. I happen to have here the report of the proceedings of a conference Secretary Straus held with representatives of labor, and I would like to read what Mr. John Mitchell said at that conference on the point just under discussion. It is published in a volume of 133 pages and is entitled "Labor Conference—Proceedings of the Conference with the Representatives of Labor held in the Office of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, February 10 and 11, 1909," and can be secured from the department, which has copies for free distribution, I believe.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Is that a government publication?

Mr. PATTEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Published by whom?

Mr. PATTEN. The Department of Commerce and Labor, last year. Mr. John Mitchell, who used to be president of the miners' union, stated in regard to the point which has just been discussed—the question being put to him by Secretary Straus as to whether immigrants did not push all other laborers up, Mr. Mitchell replied:

No; not at all. If it was, then I should say that there ought to be about 15,000 John Mitchells who were ex-presidents of the United Mine Workers of America, and who are now prominently before the people of the United States. Probably of the thousands of men who, like myself, were pushed up, I was the one who rose where the rest fell. Mr. Secretary, I know what it is to fight against influences that push

a man down. The only thing in my experience that I could not do was to beg for something to eat. I always asked a chance to work for my something to eat. But I do know hundreds of men, Mr. Secretary—I have seen them in my life and talked with them, because I have been interested in these problems—I have found hundreds of men who were not quite so sensitive as I was, but whose hardships had hardened them so that they forgot their desire to rise in the world, and, as a result of unemployment, had got into a state of mind and into a condition where they did not want work.

A man who starts out for employment is at first a respectable, high-class man, but he has no place to work and no money to buy food, and just as surely as mingling with depravity lowers a man step by step until he no longer wants to associate with honorable men, so it is that unemployment and beating your way from place to place and associating only with those who will associate with you lowers you down until you forget the condition in which you used to be or until it only comes to you like a lingering memory. Sometimes like a dream these men look back to the pinnacle on which they once were, when they were wage-earners; but they have been driven down and have become of the type that has been described. They are tramps, bums, and finally hoboes—men who no longer want work because they have got away from it, just as we find men in other classes of society who go down, down, down, until the better part of their manhood is submerged and they can not rise again. So, instead of these immigrants pushing men up to better planes of society, they push them out. Of course, I know—I have read the books that have been written about one class being supplanted by another in whole communities. I suppose you are familiar with the Slav invasion of the anthracite coal fields; how the English, Irish, and Scotch employees were there first, and then came along the Slavs, and slowly but surely drove them from place to place, and drove them up the valley. Mr. Powderly knows more about it than I do—how the English-speaking men made their last stand right up at Mr. Powderly's home, and now they are going from there. True, some of them have entered the railway service; we have lots of them who are railroad men now, and others have become policemen—strong, big, fine men. But there are hundreds of them, you will find, wandering up and down in America.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I have seen the immigrants accused of a great many things, but to be accused in that article of being tramps and hobos, that is a character by itself. You can not get a hobo to work. They never care for work. The idea of wasting our good time in reading that stuff!

Mr. BURNETT. Are not men being made tramps by being out of work?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. No, sir. You never looked into the tramp question. I was right in that business. I had the penitentiaries and workhouses and all those things under my charge. I know the tramp. The tramp is born. He is good for nothing. He will not work. He would not work for you if you give him a chance.

Mr. O'CONNELL. He is an idler.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. They would not accept work. I have asked them to come and saw my wood, and they would skip away.

Mr. PATTEN. These proceedings contain expressions of similar opinions by labor leaders and labor representatives, all in accord with Mr. Mitchell's experience. It seems to be their opinion that the present foreign immigration of from 900,000 to 1,400,000 aliens annually has the effect of making tramps, hoboes, criminals, and drunkards, etc., of those already here—that it pushes them down and out or aside, rather, or much more than up—that, as put by Mr. Gardner, the existing eighty or ninety millions of people here are too large a superstructure for the newcomers to lift.

Mr. GARDNER. Have you the resolutions passed at the last meeting of the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. PATTEN. Yes, sir; I think I have them here.

Mr. ELVINS. You stated a moment ago that the immigrant goes back at times to relieve the situation here.

Mr. SABATH. When they go back?

Mr. ELVINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. EDWARDS. Does that not put our laborers on equal footing with the country they come from?

Mr. SABATH. I said there was a greater demand here and better conditions. I said that they earned more money here. I will say this, that for every dollar that they do take when they leave, they have at least created \$3. Do you suppose that without this labor our exports would be so large in our favor?

Mr. EDWARDS. Who gets the \$3?

Mr. SABATH. The country. They create that much wealth.

Mr. EDWARDS. The laboring men do not get it.

Mr. ELVINS. If these people go back to relieve the condition, I want to know if it would also follow that if they did not come over here the condition would not be created?

Mr. SABATH. I really do believe we do need labor. You pick up any paper in the United States, not perhaps this month, but after next month, and you will find that labor is in demand. The people in the South and in the West, they want labor everywhere. They want labor on the railroads, in the mines, and in the fields, everywhere.

Mr. ELVINS. Why do they go back?

Mr. SABATH. The moment they think there is not any demand for labor a good many of them go back. I admit that the south Italians do come here, remain here during the summer months, and go back in the winter time. I myself am not in favor of the people coming here and going back, but when they do come here and make it their home, I think within a very short time they do help to advance the cause of labor.

Mr. JOHNSON. How can the interests of labor be enhanced by bringing in additional laborers?

Mr. SABATH. Because they create a larger demand for labor.

Mr. PATTEN. This resolution is taken from page 321 of the proceedings of the last annual convention of the American Federation of Labor, held last November. It is in line with previous resolutions. According to the proceedings it was a unanimous vote, no objection appearing. I imagine that if notice were sent to their legislative agent he would be glad to appear before this committee and indicate the attitude of that body.

(Mr. Patten read as follows:)

Whereas the illiteracy test is the most practical means for restricting the present stimulated influx of cheap labor, whose competition is so ruinous to the workers already here, whether native or foreign; and

Whereas an increased head tax upon steamships is needed to provide better facilities, to more efficiently enforce our immigration laws, and to restrict immigration; and

Whereas the requirement of some visible means of support would enable immigrants to find profitable employment; and

Whereas the effect of the federal bureau of distribution is to stimulate foreign immigration: Therefore be it

Resolved, By the American Federation of Labor in twenty-ninth annual convention assembled, that we demand the enactment of the illiteracy test, the money test, an increased head tax, and the abolition of the distribution bureau; and, be it further

Resolved, That we favor heavily fining the foreign steamships for bringing debarable aliens where reasons for debarment could have been ascertained at time of sale of ticket.

Mr. SABATH. Is that the entire resolution?

Mr. PATTEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SABATH. Anything on the injunction?

Mr. PATTEN. Yes, sir; according to the proceedings a number of other resolutions were adopted.

Mr. SABATH. Can you produce all the other resolutions that have been passed and read them?

Mr. PATTEN. I think they are all in the proceedings.

I have here a number of resolutions passed by state legislatures, farmers' unions, patriotic societies, boards of charities, congresses, etc., which show the attitude of the public and the universal interest in the question, and which, if it would please the committee, I would be glad to leave for incorporation in the hearing as showing a decided and widespread demand for restrictive legislation.

(The resolutions referred to by Mr. Patten follow.)

JOINT RESOLUTION PETITIONING OUR SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES IN CONGRESS
TO ENACT MORE STRINGENT IMMIGRATION LAWS.

Whereas the dumping of a million immigrants into the United States annually is a fact for which the world offers no precedent and is a menace to American institutions, the American home, and the American laborer; and

Whereas there are now many bills before the Congress of the United States for the better regulation of immigration and the revision of the tariff; and

Whereas the regulation of foreign immigration is a necessary supplement to the tariff, an essential element in the protection of America from ruinous competition by cheap labor at home, ruinous in our endeavor to establish an American industrial democracy; and

Whereas a protective tariff, without proper immigration regulation, is a travesty on the industrial problem, Therefore,

Be it resolved by the general assembly of the State of Ohio, That we respectfully ask our Senators and Representatives in Congress to enact more stringent immigration laws to protect our people, both native-born and naturalized, against wholesale immigration from foreign lands.

GRANVILLE W. MOONEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

FRANCIS W. TREADWAY,
President of the Senate.

Adopted March 12, 1909.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, OHIO,
Office of the Secretary of State.

I, Carmi A. Thompson, secretary of state of the State of Ohio, do hereby certify that the foregoing is an exemplified copy, carefully compared by me with the original rolls now on file in this office, and in my official custody as secretary of state, as required by the laws of the State of Ohio, of a joint resolution adopted by the general assembly of the State of Ohio on the 12th day of March, A. D. 1909.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my official seal, at Columbus, this 15th day of April, A. D. 1909.

[SEAL.]

CARMI A. THOMPSON,
Secretary of State.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,
March 22, 1909.

This is to certify that the following is a true and correct copy of a resolution passed the above date:

"Whereas the dumping of a million immigrants into the United States annually is a fact for which the world offers no precedent and is a menace to American institutions, the American home, and the American laborer; and

"Whereas there are now many bills before the Congress of the United States for the better regulation of immigration and the revision of the tariff; and

"Whereas the regulation of foreign immigration is a necessary supplement to the tariff, an essential element in the protection of America from ruinous competition by

cheap labor at home, ruinous in our endeavor to establish an American industrial democracy; and

“Whereas a protective tariff, without proper immigration regulation, is a travesty on the industrial problem: Therefore be it

“*Resolved by the house of representatives of the State of Pennsylvania*, That we respectfully request our Senators and Representatives in Congress to enact more stringent immigration laws to protect our people, both native born and naturalized, against wholesale immigration from foreign lands.”

THOMAS H. GARVIN,
Chief Clerk House of Representatives.

JOINT RESOLUTION TO OPPOSE IN EVERY POSSIBLE MANNER THE INFLUX INTO VIRGINIA
OF IMMIGRANTS FROM SOUTHERN EUROPE.

Resolved by the senate of Virginia (the house of delegates concurring), That our Representatives in both Houses of Congress be, and they are hereby, requested to oppose in every possible manner the influx into Virginia of immigrants from southern Europe, with their Mafia and Black Hand and murder societies, and with no characteristics to make them with us a homogeneous people, believing as we do that upon Anglo-Saxon supremacy depends the future welfare and prosperity of this Commonwealth, and we view with alarm any effort that may tend to corrupt its citizenship.

Agreed to by general assembly of Virginia February 14, 1908.

JNO. W. WILLIAMS,
Clerk House of Delegates and Keeper of Records of Virginia.

Whereas much of the greatness of the United States is due to the energetic, industrious, and patriotic immigration which came to this country during the past century; and

Whereas a strict execution of the present laws makes it possible to keep out the worst of the pauper and diseased elements of our present European and Asiatic immigration, but these laws admit large numbers of immigrants who are generally undesirable because unintelligent, of low vitality, of poor physique, able to perform only the cheapest kind of manual labor, tending to become a burden upon our large cities, and not available for supplying the need for agricultural laborers; and

Whereas the coming of these undesirable aliens tends not only to lower the standards of American citizenship but also to prevent the coming of immigrants who would be valuable workers in the country districts and who would readily assimilate with our population: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Farmers' National Congress urges upon the Senators and Representatives of the United States the importance of further judicious regulations of immigration, and in particular demands the enactment of a law raising the present head tax upon immigrants to at least \$10, and excluding absolutely immigrants of poor physique and those who are unable to read in some language.

Adopted September 14, 1905, at Richmond, Va., by the Farmers' National Congress.

Whereas the United States Immigration Commission, after a three years' investigation, reports that “many undesirable aliens enter this country every year,” and recommends legislation along the lines of our previous resolutions: Therefore,

Resolved, That we again urge upon our Senators and Representatives the judicious restriction of foreign immigration by means of an increased head tax, a money test, a rigid physical and mental test, an illiteracy test, and especially the fining of the steamship companies \$500 for every rejected alien brought to this country whose condition could have been learned at the time of purchasing passage; and be it further

Resolved, That in view of congressional action this session, we direct our officials, and particularly our legislative agent, to further in every possible way the object and purpose of these and previous resolutions.

Adopted November 7, 1909, at Raleigh, N. C., by the Farmers' National Congress.

Whereas it is proposed to distribute and divert foreign immigrants to the agricultural districts of the South and West; and

Whereas a federal bureau has been established and state immigration bureaus are proposed for that purpose; and

Whereas we are unalterably opposed to such and to the present enormous alien influx as detrimental to the best interests of the farming communities and the welfare of our whole country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, in national rally assembled at Memphis, Tenn., this 8th day of January, 1908, and representing 2,000,000 farmers, urge upon Congress the immediate abolition of the federal bureau of distribution and the speedy enactment of laws substantially excluding the present enormous alien influx by means of an increased head tax, a money requirement, the illiteracy test, and other measures; and that we call upon our public, and especially our state, officials to prevent the agricultural section from becoming a dumping ground for foreign immigration.

J. T. DICKEY (Ga.)
M. G. JACKSON (Tex.)
H. P. HUDSON (Tenn.)

Whereas, foreign immigration is being advocated for southern and western farming communities, a United States immigration commission is investigating the subject, and a federal bureau is being established for the purpose of distributing and diverting foreigners; and

Whereas the present flagrant lax enforcement of existing immigration laws and the urgent need of additional restrictive legislation will soon result in the agricultural sections of the South and West being made a dumping ground for undesirable southeast European and Asiatic populations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, in its fourth annual convention at Fort Worth, Tex., this 3d day of September, 1908, and representing over two millions of farmers, hereby adopts the immigration resolutions passed last January at the annual rally in Memphis, calling for federal and state legislation abolishing immigration bureaus and substantially excluding the present alien influx from southeast Europe and western Asia, and urge upon our federal officials the vigorous enforcement of all immigration laws in order to properly protect the country's welfare and to preserve its institutions, safeguard its citizenship, and preserve its Anglo-Saxon civilization for posterity; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to each Member of Congress by the chairman of the national legislative committee with the request that they be printed in the Congressional Record and to the Immigration Commission with the request that they be incorporated in its report; and be it further

Resolved, That the state presidents and lecturers emphasize this one question with a view to having members take it up in conference and by letter with their Congressmen and Senators.

Whereas the United States Immigration Commission will report to the next session of Congress, recommending legislation; and

Whereas we are unalterably opposed to the present foreign influx from southeast Europe and western Asia, its proposed distribution and diversion to the South and West, and have in local, state, and national convention resolved in favor of the enactment and vigorous enforcement of rigidly restrictive immigration laws: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America in fifth annual convention assembled at Birmingham, Ala., this 9th day of September, 1909, representing over 2,000,000 of farmers, reiterate and reaffirm the immigration resolutions adopted unanimously at Memphis, January 8, and at Fort Worth, September 3, 1908, calling upon our state and particularly our federal officials to exclude the present foreign influx by means of an increased head tax, a money test, the illiteracy test, and other effective measures; and be it further

Resolved, That the national legislative committee send copies of this and previous resolutions to the President for his annual message, to the immigration commission for its report, and to the Senate and House Immigration Committees for legislation, and do all it possibly can to secure legislation along the lines of this and previous resolutions; and be it still further

Resolved, That the national secretary send copies of this resolution and previous ones to the various state secretaries with the request that the matter be taken up by locals with their Senators and Congressmen with a view to congressional action.

Whereas the foreign steamship companies are bringing to this country the less desirable classes of foreigners, even the best of whom come single handed and alone, to soon return to their native lands with their parsimonious hoardings, thus causing race suicide, intensifying financial panics, undermining our standards, and menacing our institutions and ideals; and

Whereas our public lands are exhausted, city congestion is becoming intolerable, thousands of our citizens, native and naturalized, with each industrial reaction are being increasingly crowded across the Canadian and Mexican borders, and our own are being subjected to ruinous competition and frequently being driven as delinquents or dependents into our public institutions; and

Whereas the Federal Government is being urged to find employment for and even to provide transportation for aliens, exclusively, to interior points, while our own native or naturalized unemployed are left to shift for themselves; and

Whereas a rigorous enforcement of our existing feeble immigration laws is imperative for the prevention of this country being made a dump for the inmates of foreign public institutions: Therefore be it

Resolved, by the National Council, Order United American Mechanics, in its sixty-third annual session, this 24th day of August, 1909, at Providence, R. I., that we urge upon Congress the enactment of additional legislation, strengthening existing laws and further restricting foreign immigration by means of an increased head tax, a money test, the exclusion of alien adults unable to read in a European language or dialect, the fining of the foreign steamship companies for bringing here deportable immigrants, and such other measures as will exclude the present influx of foreign undesirables, protect the country's welfare, preserve its institutions, and maintain its present high ideals; and be it further

Resolved, That an immigration legislative committee be appointed by the national councillor to represent the order and further the object and purposes of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge our national, state, and local secretaries to emphasize this question with a view to having local councils pass resolutions and take the matter up with their Congressmen and Senators at the next session of Congress, when the commission reports and legislation is pending at Washington; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the national secretary to the Immigration Commission, the President, and to the members of the Senate and House Immigration Committees; and be it further

Resolved, That we heartily commend the patriotic efforts of the present commissioner of immigration at Ellis Island to properly enforce the law.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT TAMPA, FLA., FEBRUARY 13, 1908, BY THE IMMIGRATION CONVENTION, COMPOSED OF DELEGATES FROM OTHER STATES, REPRESENTING ORGANIZED LABOR, ASSOCIATIONS, PRIVATE CORPORATIONS OR INTERESTS, AND RAILROADS.

Resolved, That the several States carefully consider the question of foreign immigration as a national question, and that our Representatives in Congress be asked to urge upon Congress the enactment of such federal legislation as will effectively stem the tide of undesirable immigration now pouring into this country through the great ports of entry, and such laws as will look to the careful examination of applicants for admission at the ports of departure.

Whereas the distribution of aliens from northern cities and their diversion from abroad to the South is being agitated; and

Whereas the United States Immigration Commission is now investigating the attitude of the South toward these proposals and there is need of the farmers of Mississippi making known their wishes: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of the State of Mississippi is irrevocably opposed to the present tide of undesirable immigration now pouring into this country from sections of Europe, Asia, and Africa, which until recently sent us no immigrants, and that we urge all our officials and legislators, both state and national, to use their influence in every possible way to make clear our opposition and to secure reports and legislation that will exclude the present alien

influx, which is detrimental to our best interests and to the wellfare of our country; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to our Congressmen and Senators and to the Immigration Commission at Washington; and be it further

Resolved, That the state presidents and lecturers emphasize this one question, and that copies of this resolution be furnished the press.

(Passed unanimously by the Mississippi State Farmers' Union, at Jackson, Miss., July 8, 1908.)

Whereas it is proposed to send immigrants to the South; and

Whereas a Federal Government bureau has been created by Congress for the purpose of distributing and sending foreigners, now congesting the Northeast and coming to this country in such large numbers, to the agricultural sections of the South; and

Whereas we are unalterably opposed to such and to the present enormous alien influx from southeast Europe and western Asia, as detrimental to our best interests and the welfare of the whole country; and

Whereas the State of South Carolina abolished its bureau of immigration March 4 last and forbade the inducement of foreign immigration: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the South Carolina Division of the Farmers' Educational and Co-operative Union of America, in annual convention assembled at Columbia, this 29th day of July, 1909, and representing 60,000 farmers, indorse and adopt the immigration resolutions passed by the National Farmers' Union at Fort Worth, Tex., last September, and urge upon Congress the immediate abolition of the federal bureau of distribution, and the speedy enactment of restriction laws substantially excluding the present enormous foreign influx of over 1,000,000 per year, by means of an increased head tax, a money requirement, the illiteracy test, and other restrictive measures; and be it further

Resolved, That we call upon our State and particularly our South Carolina Congressmen and Senators to do all they can to prevent the agricultural sections being made a dump for foreign immigration; and be it still further

Resolved, That the state union secretary-treasurer send a certified copy of these resolutions to each of our United States Senators and Congressmen, and to the United States Immigration Commission, and to the Secretary of Commerce and Labor at Washington, D. C.

Whereas foreign immigration is proposed for the agricultural sections of the South; and

Whereas the Federal Government is especially investigating the attitude of southern planters toward the distribution and diversion of the present alien influx to the South; and

Whereas the farmers of Georgia are unalterably opposed to such, and are in favor of the substantial exclusion of the classes now pouring into this country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of the State of Georgia, representing over 100,000 farmers, in annual convention assembled in Macon, Ga., this 29th day of July, 1908, do hereby express our opposition to foreign immigration, and urge our state and national officials to use their utmost influence in every possible way to secure the substantial exclusion of the present foreign influx and to prevent Georgia being made the dumping ground for foreign immigration; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the Immigration Commission and the Commissioner-General at Washington, D. C., and to the Georgia general assembly and to our Congressmen and Senators; and that the local presidents and lecturers make a special point of this question in their own work.

RESOLUTION ON IMMIGRATION PASSED BY THE STATE FARMERS' UNION OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

GREENWOOD, S. C., *July 26, 1907.*

We wish to go on record as being unalterably opposed to the foreign element being distributed among the manufacturing interests in this State and other Southern States, and ask that the state support be withdrawn from the state immigration bureau and that our state and national Representatives are hereby requested not to encourage immigration.

J. B. WATSON,
JOHN T. BOGGS,
Committee.

RESOLUTION ON IMMIGRATION.

The following resolutions were unanimously adopted at the Thirty-seventh Annual Session of the State Council of Ohio, Junior Order American Mechanics, Toledo, Ohio:

Title, Regulation of immigration.

Whereas the Immigration Commission appointed under the act of February 27, 1907, has already spent more than two years of time and almost a half million dollars of money in investigating the causes and sources of immigration into the United States and the effect of such immigration upon our people; and

Whereas the dumping of a million immigrants into the United States annually is a fact for which the world offers no precedent, and is a menace to American institutions, the American home, and the American laborer; and

Whereas the regulation of foreign immigration is necessary to protect Americans from ruinous competition by cheap labor in our own country; and

Whereas a tariff on manufactured articles does not afford protection against the millions of paupers who are coming into the United States to compete with American labor; and

Whereas all good citizens are anxious for such regulation of immigration, to be prescribed by law, the application of which will result in securing only those immigrants whose standards and ideals compare favorably with our own: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the State Council of Ohio, Junior Order United American Mechanics, assembled in annual session at Toledo, Ohio, That we demand the immediate report of the Immigration Commission and amendments to present immigration laws, as follows:

1. A repeal of section 40, which authorizes the establishment of a division of information, for the reason that such division has become a government employment agency for alien laborers to the hindrance of native-born and naturalized laboring men and women already in the United States.

2. An increase in the head tax from \$4, as now collected, to \$10.

3. Require each immigrant, unless he be a political refugee, to bring with him not less than \$25 in money, in addition to the amount required to pay transportation to the point where he expects to reside or find employment.

4. Require all immigrants, between the ages of 14 and 50 years, when asked so to do by an officer of the United States, to read a section of the Constitution of the United States in an European language or dialect.

5. Deny admission to all unmarried females who are unaccompanied by a parent or brother, or who are not coming to a parent or brother; and be it further

Resolved, That the state council secretary be directed to forward a certified copy of these resolutions to the Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives from Ohio.

JESSE TAYLOR (No. 31).
REINHARD SCHWALD (No. 324).

Approved:

SMITH W. BENNETT,
E. W. KITE,
C. G. HERBRUCK,
Committee on Good of the Order.

D. S. C. Reuter, of No. 49, moved to adopt the resolution, which was agreed to.

Whereas the Patriotic Sons of America has labored consistently for the proper enforcement and enactment of federal legislation restricting foreign immigration; and

Whereas the United States Immigration Commission, after a three years' investigation, will report to the next Congress, recommending additional legislation, and since our worthy national president has so ably called attention to this important question, of such vital interest and consequence to every good American, native or naturalized: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Patriotic Order Sons of America in national camp at New York City this 30th day of September, 1909, That we commend our national president's patriotic sentiments, the work of our national legislative committee, the loyal support of members particularly to that committee, and urge upon Congress and reaffirm our belief in the enactment of a properly applied illiteracy test, an increased head tax, a money test, and such other measures as will restrict and sift out undesirable and the less assimilative aliens, and be it further

Resolved, That we indorse the patriotic efforts of the present commissioner at New York City to enforce our existing feeble immigration laws and urge our national officials, and particularly our national legislative committee, to do all they can to secure the passage of additional immigration laws and to carry out the object and purposes of these resolutions; and be it still further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent by the national secretary to the Commissioner of Immigration at New York City, the United States Immigration Commission at Washington, and the Senate and House Immigration committees.

Whereas the foreign steamship companies are making this country the only dumping ground for the Old World's least desirable peoples; and

Whereas our public domain is exhausted, population has begun to recoil upon itself, congesting in the large cities and industrial centers, where hundreds of thousands are out of employment and suffering for the common necessities of life; and

Whereas the present class of immigrants is quite detrimental to the best interest of the country's welfare; and

Whereas a Federal Immigration Commission was created over two years ago to investigate the immigration problem; and

Whereas our existing utterly inadequate immigration laws have been notoriously and scandalously relaxed by the recent Secretary of Commerce and Labor's administration of them; and

Whereas a Federal Bureau of Information was created in 1907, which has developed into an advertising device for the stimulation of foreign immigration: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Maryland State Council of the Junior Order of American Mechanics in annual session at Frostburg, this 21st day of April, 1909, That we urge upon Congress the abolition of the Division of Information, the immediate report of Immigration Commission, the vigorous enforcement of immigration laws, and the enactment of additional legislation, increasing the head tax to \$25, fining the steamship companies \$300 for bringing here any deportable or excludable alien whose condition might have been ascertained at the time of sailing, requiring the possession of visible means of support, excluding persons unable to read in a European language, as is required in South Africa, Australia, and other civilized countries, and such other requirements and tests as will substantially exclude the present undesirable alien influx, protect the country's welfare, and preserve its institutions and civilization.

Resolutions adopted at the meeting of the State Camp of Pennsylvania of the Patriotic Order Sons of America, assembled at Hazelton, Pa., August 27, 1908:

"Whereas the Patriotic Order Sons of America has labored consistently for the enactment of laws relating to the regulating of immigration of aliens to the United States, we would therefore record our pleasure at the progress already attained and herein evidence our appreciation of the services of the national committee on legislation of our order and pledge them our continued cooperation in their work.

"While recognizing that at present, owing to the prevailing financial stringency, a large number of foreigners are returning to Europe, we should not relax our efforts in legislative matters, as a return of prosperity to the country will again witness the overwhelming influx of aliens to this land: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we reaffirm our belief in the need of a properly applied educational test in the reception of the foreign born to American shores and American citizenship.

"Resolved further, That we oppose any change in the steamship air-space provision of our present law, and insist that a thorough trial of said provision be made before any change be seriously considered by Congress."

Whereas an organization calling itself the United Hebrew Trades has seen fit to denounce the very proper enforcement of the immigration laws at Ellis Island; and

Whereas the United Hebrew Trades is the only large labor organization in the United States that is built upon racial or religious lines: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the opinion of this league that the immigration policy of this Government as ordained by Congress and so efficiently enforced by Commissioner Williams should not be abrogated or set aside by any organization in which race or religion is made a test for membership.

Extracts from the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth annual reports of Boston (Mass. Associated Charities, pages 7 and 10:

"In addition to our regular work we petitioned Congress for a modification of the present immigration laws. With immigration as unrestrained as at present we can have little hope of permanent gain in the struggle of uplifting the poor people of our city, since newcomers are always at hand, ignorant of American standards.

"Nor should it be forgotten that the increase of population has come to a very considerable extent from persons who barely slip through the wide meshes of our very inadequate immigration laws. Syrians, Italians, and Russian Jews, a large proportion of our immigrants, come here fleeing from intolerable social and industrial conditions, badly equipped for the task of life in a new world, ignorant of our speech and customs and very liable to fall into difficulties which demand help from others."

Whereas a movement has recently begun in Georgia and other Southern States to promote immigration to the South, and particularly to Georgia; and

Whereas as such efforts to stimulate immigration will result in the settlement in the South, and in Georgia, of a class of foreigners who are unassimilative elements, who may hereafter become citizens of our Republic, thus inevitably tending to modify and even transform social and industrial conditions, revolutionizing and transforming the laws and form of our Government: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Georgia Federation of Labor in convention assembled, That we deplore and earnestly protest against the admission of such immigrants and against the ill-advised efforts of those whose course in soliciting immigrants will, in our opinion, result in the flooding of the South and Georgia with a population composed of the scum of Europe, a people in nowise in sympathy with the spirit of our institutions and form of government, and whose presence in our midst will foment race troubles and tend to destroy the cherished ideals of every loyal Southerner, putting us on a plane with the Northeast, with its tenements crowded with unassimilative pauper labor.

Resolved further, That we call upon our governor-elect, the honorable commissioner of agriculture, the members of the state senate and house of representatives, and our Representatives in the United States Senate and the National House of Representatives, and all other of our public officials who have the interest of the State at heart to use all honorable means within their power to discourage the movement to increase immigration; and that our Representatives in Congress be requested to support such additional legislation as will further restrict immigration, such legislation, in our opinion, making for the preservation of liberties and forms of government which our forefathers fought and died for.

We urge that our Representatives in Congress support such legislation as will require American consuls to examine the records of intending immigrants, and grant certificates to those who are able to read and write their own language, are possessed of a sufficient sum of money to support themselves and their families for a period of at least six months, and whose moral character and health are such as to entitle them to citizenship; that those who reach our shores without such certificates be deported, thus barring from our country anarchists, nihilists, paupers, criminals, the illiterate, and contract laborers.

Resolved further, That we regard the unrestricted importation of labor as calculated to inevitably cause a deterioration of the standard of American citizenship and as inimical to the interests of the members of the Georgia Federation of Labor.

Resolved further, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded by our secretary to Governor-elect Hoke Smith, the commissioner of agriculture, the Farmers' Cooperative Union, and our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Unanimously adopted July 21, 1907.

Be it resolved by the national council, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, that:

Whereas the coming of people of anarchistic tendencies and others opposed to established government, of assisted, illiterate, and pauper immigrants, and of Chinese, Japanese, and Korean laborers, endangers the peace and good order of every locality within the United States, and is a menace to American labor, American civilization, and the American standard of living: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we request all the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives to take such measures as may seem wisest to continue and perfect the policy of the United States aiming at the exclusion of all Mongolian laborers; be it further

Resolved, That we request our Representatives as aforesaid to enact laws to exclude the illiterate, degenerate, pauper, and assisted immigrants and to substantially reduce the number of immigrants coming to our country from European and other countries; be it further

Resolved, That we protest against special immigration immunity being granted to state officials to foster the growth of immigration under the false plea, "scarcity of labor;" be it further

Resolved, That we request our Representatives aforesaid to enact laws to lengthen to ten years the period of probationary citizenship and to require all aliens to read, speak, and understand the English language before the issuance of final certificate of citizenship and conferring upon them the elective franchise; be it further

Resolved, That we invite the cooperation of all labor organizations, patriotic societies, and all patriotic people, and urge them to use all honorable means to secure the votes of Senators and Congressmen who will vote for the protection of our country and its institutions against the incoming of millions of people from European and Asiatic countries by the early enactment of proper immigration, exclusion, and naturalization laws; be it further

Resolved, That the national council secretary forthwith transmit a copy of these resolutions to all Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, to the officers of the executive and legislative departments of all labor organizations and patriotic societies, and to the recording secretary of each council Junior Order United American Mechanics; be it further

Resolved, That all the officers of the national council, state councils, and councils Junior Order United American Mechanics be directed to labor in accordance with the views outlined in the foregoing resolution.

JESSE TAYLOR.

MYRON G. McCLINTON.

Attest:

MARTIN M. WOODS,
National Secretary.

RESOLUTION ON IMMIGRATION.

The following resolutions were unanimously adopted at the thirty-ninth regular and second biennial session of the National Council Junior Order United American Mechanics, Detroit, Mich.

Restriction and naturalization of immigrants.

Be it resolved by the National Council Junior Order United American Mechanics:

Whereas it is glaringly evident to the energetic, observing, and patriotic members of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, as well as every citizen of the United States of America, that the populace of the same are exhibiting a tardiness in the campaign for the restriction of immigration as well as the interests of the naturalization laws—the safety brake and valve of our citizenship; and

Whereas the items appearing in the greater part of the daily press are so extremely optimistic regarding the decrease of immigration to our shores, having the tendency to deceive and promote a feeling of false security amongst us, and those who are also striving for the correction of the immigration evils and the extreme jeopardy of our American institutions of the future; and

Whereas recent developments in "the land of the free" exposing to our citizens the existence in our midst of organized bands of criminals known as the "Black Hand Society," etc., whose damnable and nefarious practices cause brave hearts to stop at the awful dangers confronting the peace and liberty of our citizenship, have more forcibly than ever shown the results of lax immigration laws; and

Whereas the deception of optimistic newspaper editorials minimizing the immigration dangers may have a tendency to stunt the growth of powerful influences which

made themselves felt at the Capitol two years ago in the fight for laws governing immigration and calculated for the good of the nation may be the deception and the handiwork of the crafty politician, the result of the machinations of a system developed by those unprincipled and parsimonious enough to traffic in the importation of cheap foreign labor, or the result of a criminal or ignorant representatives of the press of the country; and

Whereas certain laws and amendments relating to immigration and naturalization and derogatory to our principles of American protection were proposed at the last session of Congress; and

Whereas the laws of the country relating to immigration and naturalization are inadequate and incapable for the performance of those restrictions we deem necessary for the welfare of the United States of America; and

Whereas the very bone and sinew of this order—the development and maintenance of good citizenship—are threatened for the present and the coming generations: Be it

Resolved, That the National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics establish a rigid campaign for such laws as are necessary for the correction of these evils, and that a liberal appropriation be provided therefor; and further be it

Resolved, That the national council commend the work of the secret-service men and officials who unearthed the vile organization of foreigners who so harassed the citizenship of our country and endangered the very lives thereof; and further be it

Resolved, That the establishment of an office in Washington during the next session of Congress, and the installation therein of an active, capable, and diplomatic representative, be instituted by the national legislative committee, under its supervision, to further the interests of the legislative principles of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics and the integrity of the Government of our Republic; and further be it

Resolved, That the committee on legislation of this body wage energetic and continuous efforts to have the Immigration Commission, created under section 39 of the immigration act of February 20, 1907 (as directed by resolution passed by the United States Senate in February, 1909), submit its final report to the next session of the Sixty-first Congress, December, 1909; and further be it

Resolved, That then all efforts should be made by the legislative committee to labor for the enactment of such laws as will properly protect our people against the present indiscriminate immigration from all countries, for there is no knowledge of the recommendations of said Immigration Commission.

THE OHIO DELEGATION,
By JOHN J. WEITZEL.

Whereas the agricultural class of the State of Louisiana, having thoroughly considered every phase of the problem of immigration, see in the promiscuous importation of an undesirable class of citizens in our State a deterioration in the standard of its farming element:

Resolved, That we, the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America and State of Louisiana, ask our legislators and Senators to express themselves publicly on this issue.

Resolved, That we use our influence with the powers of the State to secure the enactment of such laws as will restrict or prohibit this wholesale importation of a lower class of immigrants.

Attest:

G. D. DUPREE, *Chairman*.

Adopted at Louisiana Farmers' Union state convention, July 31, 1908.

Your committee, appointed to submit resolutions relative to the questions of immigration referred to in the general master workman's address, would respectfully submit the following:

We are heartily in accord with the views expressed in the abuses of the immigration laws in turning the bureau of the Department of Commerce and Labor into an advertising agency and an employment bureau for obtaining employment for incoming immigrants, who are thus being furnished better opportunities for securing employment than citizens and residents of this country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the Knights of Labor condemns that clause of the present law known as "section 40 of the act of Congress approved February 20, 1907," entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States," and urges upon Congress the immediate repeal of that section of the law, coupled with the abolition of the bureau of information and distribution, which is working grave injury to labor generally in this country.

Resolved, That we urge upon Congress the retention of section 42 of the said act, and the adoption of such further restrictions as will prevent this country from being made the dumping ground of hordes of foreign immigrants for commercial purposes and to the injury of American labor.

. Adopted by the National General Assembly of Knights of Labor, November 9, 1908.

JOHN W. HAYES,

General Master Workman.

I. D. CHAMBERLAIN,

General Secretary-Treasurer.

Whereas the Republican party platforms of 1896 and 1900 contained planks favoring the further restriction of immigration; and

Whereas the representatives of that party have been in complete control of the Congress of the United States for the past ten years and have failed to carry out these pledges: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen in seventh biennial convention assembled, at Buffalo, N. Y., this 24th day of May, 1905, That we criticise the representatives of the Republican party in Congress for their failure to make good their pledges with regard to legislation for a further restriction of immigration.

RESOLUTION OF P. O. S. OF A. DISTRICT CONVENTION, HELD AT WOOLRICH, PA., NOVEMBER 27, 1909.

Resolved, That we urge the enactment of an immigration law that will properly restrict immigration with a per capita tax and examination that will require physical, mental, and other attainments, and a fine of \$500 on transportation companies that bring over improper persons, when their unfitness was clearly discernible by the agents of the companies transporting them.

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE AMERICAN PURITY FEDERATION, AT BURLINGTON, IOWA, OCTOBER 21, 1909.

Whereas the Immigration Commission reports thousands of undeniably undesirable persons being brought to this country every year by the foreign steamships for the profit in the traffic: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Purity Federation urges the Congress of the United States to increase the steamship head tax, to debar undesirable aliens by the illiteracy test, a money requirement and a character certificate, to require young girls to be accompanied by or to come to a near relative, and to fine the steamships \$300 for bringing an undesirable alien, when the undesirability could have been ascertained before embarkation; and be it still further

Resolved, That this federation heartily indorses the efficient enforcement of the law inaugurated by Commissioner William Williams at Ellis Island.

The Republican platform of 1896 said: "For the protection of the equality of American citizenship and of wages of our working men against the fatal competition of low-priced labor, we demand that the immigration laws be thoroughly enforced and so extended as to exclude from entrance to the United States those who can neither read nor write."

The Republican platform of 1900 said: "In the further interests of American workmen we favor a more effective restriction of the immigration of cheap labor from foreign lands."

President McKinley, in his inaugural address, March 4, 1897, said: "Illiteracy must be banished from the land if we shall attain that destiny as the foremost nation of the world," etc.

President Roosevelt said in his message to Congress December 3, 1901: "The second object of a proper immigration law ought to be to secure by a careful and not merely perfunctory educational test some intelligent capacity to appreciate American institutions and act sanely as American citizens. Both the educational and economic test in a wise immigration law should be designed to protect and elevate the great body politic and social."

Thereupon the committee adjourned.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Tuesday, February 15, 1910.

The committee met at 10.30 o'clock a. m., Hon. Benjamin F. Howell (chairman) presiding. Others present were Representatives Bennet, Burnett, Edwards, Elvins, Gardner, of Massachusetts, Goldfogle, Hayes, Küstermann, Moore, of Texas, O'Connell, and Sabath.

STATEMENT OF MR. BENJAMIN S. CABLE, ASSISTANT SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR, ACCOMPANIED BY MR. WILLIAM L. SOLEAU, DISBURSING CLERK; MR. CHARLES EARL, SOLICITOR; AND MR. W. F. ANDREWS, OF THE BUREAU OF IMMIGRATION, IN CHARGE OF STATISTICS.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Cable, the Assistant Secretary, is here to represent the Secretary and will answer any questions the committee may wish to ask him. Have you looked over this bill, H. R. 13404?

Mr. BENNET. I might say that Mr. Cable is here in response to an invitation from the committee in relation to the charge that the head tax is not being collected. You are here in response to the invitation sent to Secretary Nagel?

Secretary CABLE. Well, with reference to the head-tax matters.

Mr. BENNET. Have you brought with you any officers of the Department or Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization?

Mr. CABLE. I have brought Mr. Soleau, the disbursing officer; Mr. Earl, the solicitor; and Mr. Andrews, of the Bureau of Immigration, in charge of statistics in that bureau.

Mr. BENNET. Do you prefer to make a statement yourself or have those officers who have more immediate charge make a statement?

Mr. CABLE. I think, Mr. Bennet, that possibly it would be better for you or for the chairman, or members of the committee, to ask such questions, and those of us who are competent to answer them will do so. I do not understand exactly what the committee wants.

Mr. BENNET. The general statement has been made that the amount of head tax collected during the last few years has not been sufficient in each year to meet the expenses of the Bureau of Immigration, both the expenses of the home office and the expenses of administering the acts, first, of 1903, and later of 1907. I would like to have you give whatever facts there are in connection with that.

Mr. CABLE. I should first of all say that that statement is not correct. Do you want a statement as to the last three years? I have brought those figures with me.

Mr. BENNET. That is far enough back.

Mr. CABLE. The receipts from head tax for the year 1907 amounted to \$2,829,783.93.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. In what year did you say?

Mr. CABLE. 1907. And the expenses of the Bureau of Immigration for the same year were in round numbers \$2,100,000.

Mr. HAYES. That is the fiscal year you are speaking of?

Mr. CABLE. Yes, sir. Making the receipts from head tax approximately \$700,000 more than the expenses.

Mr. BURNETT. I did not catch your last statement in regard to the disbursements, the expenses.

Mr. CABLE. \$2,100,000. For the year 1908 the receipts from the head tax were \$3,400,000 and the disbursements \$2,600,000, making \$800,000 over the expenditures. Now, in 1909 I am not sure that these figures are as accurate, but they are substantially correct; the receipts from head tax were \$3,200,000 and the expenses were \$2,500,000. You will see that the receipts from the head tax run approximately \$700,000 over the expenditures for each of those three years.

Mr. BENNET. Do those figures which you have given, of expenditures, include the expenses of the Immigration Commission for those years?

Mr. CABLE. No, sir; they do not.

Mr. BENNET. Can you give those in addition?

Mr. CABLE. No; I do not think we have any record of those at all.

Mr. BENNET. Well, it has been rather widely stated, and it is substantially accurate, that the expenditures of the Immigration Commission, since its organization, was \$657,000.

Mr. SABATH. That is the report, is it not?

Mr. BENNET. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. That must be correct, then.

Mr. BENNET. And should be deducted from the immigrant fund, in addition to the figures given by Mr. Cable.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Now, without considering the expenses of the Immigration Commission, as just now stated by Mr. Bennet, what is the amount of the immigrant fund at the present time? Can you tell?

Mr. CABLE. There is no fund?

Mr. SABATH. It has been turned over to the general fund of last year?

Mr. CABLE. You see, we receive an appropriation of, I think it is, \$2,400,000, and that appropriation is paid out of what is called the "immigrant fund" in the Treasury; you see we have no control whatever over that fund.

Mr. SABATH. Since last year?

Mr. CABLE. Well, I think it is only for the last year.

Mr. BENNET. Isn't it a fact—and, of course, we know it to be a fact—that despite the amount collected from the head tax, there was a limitation in the statute of 1907, and only two and a half million dollars went for the uses of your bureau for all purposes, including the expenses of the Immigration Commission?

Mr. CABLE. Yes; there is a provision in the statute that it was not to be more than two and a half million dollars.

Mr. BENNET. In any year?

Mr. CABLE. Yes; I think that is the way it reads.

Mr. BURNETT. And, therefore, your bureau did not receive the total amount of the tax collected in any fiscal year since 1907?

Mr. CABLE. That is my understanding, yes, that this money goes into the Treasury and we have no control over it whatever; the only way in which we are interested is in the fact that our appropriation is paid out of this immigrant fund.

Mr. BURNETT. As made up by head-tax receipts?

Mr. BENNET. In those figures have you included here the expenses of buildings?

Mr. CABLE. Well, I think they are covered by special appropriations.

Mr. SABATH. But were deducted from the immigrant fund and charged to the immigrant fund?

Mr. SOLEAU. They were charged against the \$2,500,000, every time a dollar was taken out of the special appropriation.

Mr. BENNET. Are those expenses included in the amounts?

Mr. SOLEAU. They are not.

Mr. BENNET. Have you figures showing those amounts?

Mr. SOLEAU. Yes, sir; there was transferred from the immigrant fund to build an immigrant station at Charleston, S. C., by the act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stats., 1415), \$70,000.

Mr. BENNET. That is not exactly the question I was asking; what I am asking is the amount actually spent each year.

Mr. SOLEAU. Mr. Bennet, I will answer that question. Every dollar of this is practically spent, for the purpose of ascertaining the amount of money taken from the immigrant fund, for the reason that these special appropriations, when taken out never revert again to the immigrant fund; any balances left over will go to the surplus of the Treasury, and they have not been spent for the stations yet.

Mr. BENNET. You see that that does not get at the fact that I wanted.

Mr. HAYES. What year is he speaking of now?

Mr. BENNET. I am not limiting him to any year. The fact I wanted to get at is this: Of course, I am familiar with the fact that commencing in the year 1908 all the appropriations were charged up against the immigrant fund; that is a matter of bookkeeping; what I want to get at is how much was actually spent each year. Now, for instance, Charleston, you have not spent \$70,000, or Galveston or New Orleans?

Mr. SOLEAU. If you want actual expenditures, that is something else; but I want the committee to understand that that money is irrevocable by reason of these special acts taking away from the immigrant fund.

Mr. O'CONNELL. It is not spent, is it?

Mr. SOLEAU. It is not spent in the sense of paying it out, but it is a created liability; it will be spent as fast as the department can make the proper contracts for its expenditure.

Mr. O'CONNELL. And that money will go into permanent improvements?

Mr. SOLEAU. Yes, sir.

Mr. BENNET. It lays there in the Treasury subject to draft?

Mr. SOLEAU. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAYES. Then it should be charged up to the fund, should it not?

Mr. SOLEAU. It has already been charged up.

Mr. BENNET. Do those figures given by Mr. Cable include, outside of immigrant stations and the Immigration Commission, the money actually spent each year?

Mr. SOLEAU. No, sir; they do not include any permanent improvements; these are the current operating expenses that Mr. Cable gave a statement of.

Mr. BENNET. Let us take the condition of the buildings each year, commencing with the fiscal year 1906, if you can.

Mr. SOLEAU. There have been \$418,000, in round numbers, spent on account of the immigrant station at Ellis Island, and for buildings——

Mr. BENNET. What fiscal year?

Mr. SOLEAU. That \$418,000 was appropriated by the act of February 14, 1908 (35 Stats., p. 20), and that money has all been spent. In addition to that there has been an expenditure of \$115,000 at the same station under the act of May 30, 1908 (35 Stats., p. 508), all spent.

Mr. BURNETT. How much?

Mr. SOLEAU. One hundred and fifteen thousand dollars, in round numbers. In other words, all the money that has been appropriated. Now, the appropriations for the other immigrant stations, Charleston, \$70,000; Galveston, \$70,000; New Orleans, \$70,000; Philadelphia, \$250,000, has not been spent; the funds are practically intact; there have been a few dollars spent in traveling expenses to make surveys with the view of drawing plans for those stations.

Mr. BENNET. Then, has there been any year in the last three fiscal years—I suppose that is as far as it is necessary to go back—in which the administration of the immigration law and the amount actually expended for buildings has equaled or exceeded the amount of the head tax paid into the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. SOLEAU. No; not until the beginning of the fiscal year 1909 was there any trouble in the fund; we were approaching trouble all the time, but did not meet it until then.

Mr. O'CONNELL. What do you mean by trouble?

Mr. SOLEAU. Why, that the fund would be exhausted. If you will let me put into your record here a general statement I think it will assist you in getting at this situation.

Mr. BENNET. I do not want to confuse the fund with the receipts; the fund consisted of two and a half million dollars, while the receipts included all the moneys received.

Mr. SOLEAU. If you will permit me to begin with July 1, 1907, and bring it down to the beginning of the fiscal year 1909, I think I will shed some light on this subject, if it is agreeable to the committee.

Mr. BURNETT. You mean the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909, when you speak of the fiscal year 1909?

Mr. SOLEAU. I said the beginning. The gentleman seems to be somewhat confused in regard to these special appropriations; I will admit that they are complex on account of the method of legislating every year. For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1907, the total amount to the credit of the appropriation for expenses of regulating immigration, was \$1,815,983.19.

Mr. HAYES. What year was that; July 1, 1907?

Mr. SOLEAU. That is what we started off with that year.

Mr. BURNETT. How much?

Mr. SOLEAU. \$1,815,983.19. Under section 1, of the act of February 20, 1907, \$2,500,000; of the head tax was added to that fund, making a total to begin business with on that date, on July 1, 1907, of \$4,556,049.79.

Mr. HAYES. That is July 1, 1907?

Mr. SOLEAU. Yes; that is what we started off with that first year; that is the immigrant fund available for regulating expenses during that year.

Mr. BENNET. During that year?

Mr. SOLEAU. Yes, sir. Now, during the year there was charged to it, that is the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, bear in mind, the general running expenses, of \$2,145,846.99; the figures that Mr. Cable has just furnished are the disbursements by me. There was transferred from the immigrant fund, on account of the immigrant station at Charleston, S. C., the sum of \$70,000; transferred from the immigrant fund on account of immigrant station at Galveston, Tex., \$70,000; transferred from the immigrant fund on account of the immigrant station at New Orleans, La., \$70,000; transferred from the immigrant fund on account of salaries, Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, 1908, \$91,600.

Mr. SABATH. What was that for?

Mr. SOLEAU. There is an act of Congress which says there shall be no persons employed in the District of Columbia unless their salaries are specifically provided for, and to overcome that law Congress every year makes, in detail, an appropriation for so many clerks under the commissioner-general and the assistant commissioner-general, to be employed here in Washington. Transferred from the immigrant fund on account of the enforcement of the Chinese-exclusion act, \$500,000; transferred from the immigrant fund on account of immigrant station, Ellis Island, New York, \$418,000; transferred from the immigrant fund on account of Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service, 1908, \$150,000; transferred from the immigrant fund on account of immigrant station at Philadelphia, Pa., \$250,000; transferred from the immigrant fund on account of immigrant station, Ellis Island, New York, an additional sum of \$115,000. That, taken together with the expenses which could not be charged to any particular year, which were coming in for settlement during that year—there was in one case disbursements by other officers amounting to \$25,487.31, and miscellaneous treasury settlements, \$23,521.31, and \$75,677.14 advanced during that year to Immigration Commission, making a total charge against the fund for that year of \$4,005,132.75, leaving a balance to be transferred under section 1 of the immigrant act of February 20, 1907, of \$550,917.04. During the fiscal year 1909 we met with trouble on account of the reduced immigration, and at many times there was no balance in this fund at all, and the best statistics that we could put together indicated that there would be a large deficiency by reason of the falling off in the head tax, due to the falling off of immigration.

Mr. HAYES. Which you estimated to be about \$600,000?

Mr. SOLEAU. Yes, sir; and I am still proud of the estimate. Now, we add to the \$550,917.04, \$2,500,000, which was added, providing the head tax reached that sum during this fiscal year, pursuant to section 1 of the act of February 20, 1907, making a total to start the year with of \$3,050,917.04.

Mr. BURNETT. To start what year?

Mr. SOLEAU. The fiscal year ending June 30, 1909.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. That amount was in the Treasury?

Mr. SOLEAU. No, sir; it was not then in the Treasury, but the amount reached the Treasury from head tax before the fiscal year was over; it was along in the spring of 1909 before that money was actually in the Treasury. My accounts showed at one time a balance due me from the Government as high as \$500,000 because of an arrangement with the Secretary of the Treasury that we might use

temporarily other moneys until we could ask Congress for relief or the head tax would make the specified amount. Now, the special charges against that fund during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909, were: Pay of assistant attorneys, and so forth, in naturalization cases under the Department of Justice, \$150,000; salaries, Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, 1909, \$64,940; Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service, \$200,000; immigrant station, Ellis Island, New York, for dredging, \$65,000; ferry steamer, San Francisco, Cal., \$115,000; boarding cutter, San Francisco, Cal., \$25,000; and enforcement of the Chinese-exclusion act, \$500,000, making a total charge of \$1,119,940 against the fund for that year, and leaving a balance for the expenses of regulating immigration during the year of \$1,930,977.04.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Have you figures there as to deportation? How much did the deportation of immigrants cost during the year?

Mr. SOLEAU. We have no account along those lines.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I understood there was about \$300,000 of cost attached to that.

Mr. SOLEAU. Mr. Cable has directed that a liability account shall be established in the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization with a view of showing every year all of these things.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Where would the items appear that make up the expenses for deporting persons from the United States?

Mr. SOLEAU. They appear in this expenditure of \$2,145,846.99.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Is there no record showing the details of that expenditure?

Mr. SOLEAU. Not with such fineness; no.

Mr. HAYES. Then, Mr. Soleau, for the fiscal year 1909, from the figures you have just given us, what does the actual balance sheet show? Was there a deficit?

Mr. SOLEAU. There was a deficit; the balance sheet of to-day shows a deficit of \$615,000 for that year, brought about by the difference between the balance brought over from the appropriation and the total expenses for that year, which were the salaries in the bureau, because I have taken them out in this statement, and the expenses of enforcing the Chinese exclusion act, because I have taken them out in this statement, of \$1,994,507.55, leaving approximately \$200,000 for us, and the balance of the deficiency was made up by the Immigration Commission.

Mr. BENNET. Have you had at your disposition in the fiscal years 1908 and 1909 the total amount collected from the immigrants at \$4 per head? What would your balance sheet have shown on the 1st of July, 1909?

Mr. SOLEAU. If we could have used the fund without drafts from the Immigration Commission, but including all the drafts for special appropriations, we would have come out about \$54,000 short.

Mr. BENNET. You do not catch my question; you are basing your estimate right along on the——

Mr. SOLEAU. On what we had.

Mr. BENNET. Yes; on the limited fund of two and a half million dollars each year, aren't you?

Mr. BURNETT. Suppose you had received the amount collected from immigrants in addition to the two and a half million dollars?

Mr. SOLEAU. I haven't that in detail, but I can give it to you from a mental calculation; in round numbers we would have had \$2,200,000 left over; but then we would have had to take out of these those specials.

Mr. CABLE. I understand what you want is the total of the head-tax receipts and then the total of all disbursements?

Mr. BENNET. Yes.

Mr. HAYES. We want everything; we want the fines, we want the amount you got in for naturalization fees.

Mr. CABLE. That is under a separate appropriation.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Soleau, couldn't we get these figures accurately by your sending them to us in the form we ask?

Mr. SOLEAU. Well, we can put it in, of course; but I can put it in now for you within a few minutes.

Mr. HAYES. But it is taking our time, and you could prepare a detailed statement for the last four years, showing the exact amount collected from the head tax and all the expenses, incidental and otherwise, of the administration of the immigration law.

Mr. SOLEAU. Well, we will give you an analysis of the fund.

Mr. BURNETT. No, everything you find we want.

Mr. SABATH. The things we want are the gross receipts and the gross expenditures.

Mr. SOLEAU. In other words, Mr. Bennet, you want the gross receipts from the head tax without any regard as to what it was provided to settle for and you want to take from it all the expenditures that were chargeable to the head tax for maintaining the immigration service; is that it?

Mr. BENNET. No. We want all the head tax; we want all the money from the privileges, we want all the money paid by steamship companies for meals, because that is charged to the fund when you pay it out; we want all the money paid by steamship companies for hospital and other accommodations, because that is charged against the fund and reimbursed.

Mr. SABATH. And all the fines.

Mr. BENNET. We want the amount of fines; in other words, everything from which the immigrant fund is made up. We want you to put all those figures in, and then, on the other side of the ledger of your balance sheet, we want all the expenses of regulating immigration, all the expenses of buildings, permanent improvements, the amount drawn by the Immigration Commission; we want them all; anything else that may go to make up the account; the Washington office, and anything else that ought to be charged.

Mr. CABLE. I do not know where he will get the figures as to the Immigration Commission. You haven't those, have you, Mr. Bennet?

Mr. BENNET. I will give you those.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. When is this to start, 1907?

Mr. HAYES. The 1st of July, 1907.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. When did the Immigration Commission first commence to cause expense?

Mr. SABATH. July 1, 1907.

Mr. BURNETT. Can you start the statement with July, 1906, and bring in your receipts and disbursements for those three years?

Mr. SOLEAU. We can do that.

Mr. BENNET. Of course, that will cover the \$2 year, the year in which the head tax was but \$2.

Mr. SOLEAU. I was going to say you are going to compare apples and pears.

Mr. HAYES. Well, we want it in that way. You have stated that the deficit for 1908 was \$615,000; have you any deficit——

Mr. SOLEAU. No, sir; I didn't state that; pardon me for differing with you; it was the year 1909 that I stated there was a deficit of \$615,000.

Mr. HAYES. Can you give us the next year?

Mr. SOLEAU. The year preceding 1909?

Mr. HAYES. No; after.

Mr. SOLEAU. The current year, the year we are in, 1910?

Mr. HAYES. No; the preceding year, 1908.

Mr. SOLEAU. There was no deficit; in the figures furnished I showed that we carried over \$550,917.04; there was no deficit.

Mr. CABLE. As I understand it these deficits are caused by the outstanding liabilities for work not yet completed.

Mr. SOLEAU. Well, if this young man may be permitted to raise his pen, I can make a statement that may be of interest to the committee.

Mr. GARDNER. I object to that.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. What objection can there be to that? I will ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to make a statement without having it go into the record.

Mr. GARDNER. I object.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. What is your reason? Certainly there can be no objection to that.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Well, I move that the gentleman be allowed to make a statement that need not go into the record.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. No; that would not be right.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman has asked me to give my reason. I will say that my reason for objecting is because there is a representative here of one of the Associated Press bureaus.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you had better not make the statement, if it is not to go into the record.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. We ought to get all the information possible.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you understand what we want; we want the entire receipts and we want the entire disbursements on account of the immigrant fund.

Mr. SOLEAU. Yes; in a different form than it has been given.

Mr. BURNETT. How much was on hand in the immigrant fund when the increased head tax began—the total amount?

Mr. SOLEAU. The increased head tax began from July 1, 1907; I believe that is right, Mr. Bennet, isn't it?

Mr. BENNET. Yes.

Mr. SOLEAU. We had on hand at that date \$1,815,983.19 to start it with.

Mr. BURNETT. Now, how much is now to the credit of the immigrant fund?

Mr. SOLEAU. Nothing.

Mr. SABATH. Why?

Mr. SOLEAU. For the reason that all the money appropriated by Congress, or that Congress has permitted to be taken away from the

head-tax receipts each year and added to the fund each year, amounting to \$2,500,000, was not sufficient to pay the expenses of regulating immigration, enforcing Chinese exclusion; amounts appropriated for buildings and improvements, and to enforce the naturalization laws in one year.

Mr. SABATH. I didn't wish to know that. It is because you have not received the entire amount which was received from the head tax, and you only base your figures on the amount that was allowed the department, namely, two and a half million dollars, and the balance has been drawn from the general fund that is in the Treasury; that is true, is it not?

Mr. SOLEAU. I am not prepared just now to say that that is absolutely true; I will say that that is true in the event the taking out of all these special appropriations for other purposes will not exceed the difference: then you are right.

Mr. SABATH. You now base your figures on the two and a half million dollars allowed by the act of 1907?

Mr. SOLEAU. No, sir; in answering your question I took into consideration the whole receipts.

Mr. SABATH. The whole receipts for three years would give about \$9,500,000?

Mr. SOLEAU. Correct.

Mr. BENNET. The expenses you have given about \$7,300,000?

Mr. SOLEAU. That is on operation absolutely, but I have not taken into consideration these specials.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Let me ask you, to get this clear, suppose you state in your own way how you account for this difference of two million and odd dollars.

Mr. BENNET. He is going to give us that in a statement.

Mr. GARDNER. My reason for wanting everything to go into the record was because I did not care to have anything remembered by hearsay, because you know and I know that you may remember one way and I will remember another way. I did not object to anything that Mr. Soleau might want to state as a matter for the record.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. True; and his answer to my question would be a part of the record.

Mr. SOLEAU. So far as making a statement is concerned it would only have an indirect bearing on the causes for these special appropriations being taken from the immigrant fund, and that is all, and as it relates to the policy of a legislative body I do not care to make the statement for publication.

Mr. HAYES. I would like to ask you to state, if you can do so, what the balance was on the 1st of July last, when the fund was finally abolished?

Mr. SOLEAU. Now, on the 1st of July last, as I said, we had a deficiency of over \$600,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909; there was no balance; we were \$600,000 on the wrong side of the ledger.

Mr. BENNET. That is, of course, based on your fund of two and a half million dollars?

Mr. SOLEAU. Yes; absolutely.

Mr. BENNET. I would like to ask Mr. Cable or Mr. Earl, or both, as to a statement which has been made here; the statement made here was that there were administrative regulations, required by the

statutes, of course, which had the effect of so reducing the head tax that 500,000 aliens had come in, as I understood, since the 1st of July, 1907, without paying the head tax. Is that an accurate statement of fact?

Mr. CABLE. Well, I should say that that was very inaccurate; we can get the figures on that; there are undoubtedly a number of aliens that come in every year without paying the head tax under the regulations provided for by law.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. That is, they come in a second time?

Mr. CABLE. Yes; aliens who have had a residence of one year in some part of North America or Cuba; for instance, Mexico, Canada, and Cuba are the only ones I can think of now. If they had a year's residence in any one of those countries they can come in without paying the head tax; the law so provides.

Mr. BURNETT. Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, too?

Mr. CABLE. Yes. The regulations of the department, under rule 2, I think it is, or rule 1, provide that where an alien has acquired a domicile in the United States and goes to Canada and Mexico and remains less than a year and reenters the United States that he is not charged a head tax.

Mr. HAYES. Where do you get the authority of law for that?

Mr. CABLE. I was asking our solicitor about it; it seemed rather doubtful to me.

Mr. HAYES. I do not find any law that warrants it.

Mr. CABLE. I did not either, and I asked the solicitor why, and he gave me an explanation, and I think he would be glad to give it to you gentlemen now. I made the same inquiry you are making now; I did not understand it.

Mr. EARL. Well, gentlemen, this regulation was framed with a view to carrying out the exemption contained in section 1 of the immigration act.

Mr. HAYES. That is specific, is it not?

Mr. EARL. Yes; that is specific, but representations were, as I understand it, made to the State Department by Canada, particularly, that this rule, as originally adopted, which was in literal conformity, as I recall it, with the act, was creating a great deal of friction on the Canadian border, and the matter was taken up between the Department of Commerce and Labor and the Department of State; and Mr. Root, who was present before the Committee on Immigration when this exemption was made in the present act, in the act of 1907, reported what he understood to be the purpose of the committee in making a certain amendment in that respect, and he said that in his opinion, as a matter of law, the exemption was clearly intended to apply to these cases; that is, citizens of Canada who had resided—whose absence from Canada was merely temporary. There were two classes; first, citizens of Canada who had taken up a residence in the United States and had gone back to Canada for a few months and returned again to their domicile in the United States, and, in the second place, residents of Canada who were bona fide residents of that country, but who in the previous year had temporarily departed for a week or two. And it was after this conference between the Department of Commerce and Labor and the State Department that the rule was amended and framed as it now stands.

Mr. HAYES. You are a lawyer, are you?

Mr. EARL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAYES. You do not state, and you would not state, I presume, that there is any authority in the law at all for that construction?

Mr. EARL. Well, I think there is, Mr. Hayes.

Mr. HAYES. I would like to have you point it out.

Mr. EARL. I have written an opinion on the subject.

Mr. HAYES. The law is very specific and positive, no exceptions are made.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. In regard to what?

Mr. BURNETT. Is it not right in the face of the law?

Mr. SABATH. Won't you please give him a chance to make his answer.

Mr. EARL. Mr. Chairman, I have stated my view of the law in an opinion that I took a great deal of pains with; it is a long while ago and I do not remember now all the reasons which led me finally to the conclusion that I reached. I have given, in a general way, the occasion which led to the taking up of this question.

Mr. HAYES. As a lawyer you would practically agree with me that in such a case the thing to do would be to come to Congress and have an amendment passed so as to have it in the law?

Mr. EARL. As a lawyer I reached a different conclusion.

Mr. HAYES. Will you please send me a copy of your opinion?

Mr. EARL. I will be very glad to do that.

Mr. GARDNER. Didn't we consider that in connection with a street railroad over the Rio Grande where people paid 5 cents to go over and the question was whether they had to pay \$2 head tax as well?

Mr. EARL. I am not sure whether that came up at that time.

Mr. GARDNER. I think that is the same question; when a passenger from Mexico crossed the Rio Grande on the street railroad, paying either 5 or 10 cents, and desired to return, the question was whether they had to spend \$2 in addition to their railroad fare.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Each time they made the trip? Why, under the strict construction of the law they wouldn't have to pay that \$2, would they?

Mr. BENNET. Surely.

Mr. GARDNER. I remember that Mr. Slayden brought up the case of an Englishman residing in Texas who used to go backward and forward.

Mr. SABATH. Have you read section 1?

Mr. HAYES. I have read it.

Mr. SABATH. That shows that.

Mr. BENNET. Senator Root, at that time Secretary of State, did not come before the full committee; he came before a subcommittee of which Mr. Gardner was chairman, Mr. Burnett was a member, Mr. Ellerbe was a member, and I was a member, and I think Mr. Moore was also a member.

Mr. EARL. I didn't know that; I understood that he appeared before the full committee.

Mr. BURNETT. I do not recall that any such thing as that occurred on the part of the subcommittee, that that should be the construction.

Mr. BENNET. We sent for him and asked him what should be done.

Mr. EARL. It was my understanding that he took up the matter with you gentlemen.

Mr. SABATH. Have you a record of what took place between the Secretary of State and your office?

Mr. EARL. I presume it is in the department.

Mr. SABATH. Well, I presume we can have it, can we not?

Mr. EARL. Well, I presume so.

Mr. HAYES. What would be the object of that?

Mr. SABATH. To show what the case was, who requested the matter, how it came about, and what was done. We can get the entire information, because Mr. Gardner, Mr. Bennet, and Mr. Burnett do not clearly remember what transpired at that time.

Mr. GARDNER. I remember the fact that Secretary Root appeared, but I do not remember the particulars.

Mr. SABATH. Perhaps that information would enlighten the committee.

Mr. BENNET. The regulation which you have referred to affects aliens residing in Cuba, Mexico, Newfoundland, and Canada; do you know of any regulation diminishing in any way the efficacy of the collection of the revenues so far as the trans-Atlantic or trans-Pacific traffic is concerned?

Mr. EARL. No. You mean otherwise than as provided by law?

Mr. BENNET. Yes.

Mr. EARL. No, I do not; I do not, of course, concede that this regulation in any way violates the law.

Mr. BENNET. I beg your pardon for having put the question in that form. However, you drew the regulation?

Mr. EARL. I drew that one; yes.

Mr. HAYES. What regulation do you refer to?

Mr. EARL. Regulation No. 2.

Mr. HAYES. You refer to transients coming from abroad?

Mr. EARL. I referred generally to rule 2.

Mr. BURNETT. On what page is it?

Mr. EARL. Page 27, rules 1 and 2.

Mr. HAYES. "F" under rule 2 is what I refer to.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. You have reference to aliens who enter merely for the purpose of transit?

Mr. HAYES. Aliens in transit through the United States.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. A person coming here the second time, is he charged a head tax?

Mr. EARL. Yes.

Mr. HAYES. Is that so? Since when?

Mr. SOLEAU. Always.

Mr. HAYES. Isn't it true that on the 3d day of December, 1908, the Secretary rendered a decision which runs about like this:

That aliens who have established a domicile are not aliens within the meaning of the immigration law, and therefore can not be held under any of its provisions once the fact of this domicile is established.

When aliens return from abroad, after once establishing a domicile, they are treated like natives or naturalized citizens?

Mr. CABLE. Is that an opinion of the solicitor?

Mr. HAYES. No, by Secretary Straus; it is dated December 3, 1908.

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Earl, you can probably explain that. You were here and I was not.

Mr. SABATH. That is based on section 1, is it not?

Mr. HAYES. There is nothing in section 1 like that.

Mr. SABATH. It says:

That the said tax shall not be levied upon aliens who shall enter the United States after an uninterrupted residence of at least one year, immediately preceding such entrance, in the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland, the Republic of Cuba, or the Republic of Mexico—

And why should not it also apply to people of the United States?

Mr. HAYES. Well, it does not; that is the point.

Mr. SABATH. If we make that provision for those that reside at least one year in these countries why should not it also apply when they have established their domicile in this country?

Mr. EARL. I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, in that connection that Secretary Straus has ruled, and the department has ruled occasionally in specific cases, that an alien who has established a bona fide, permanent domicile in the United States is not an alien within the meaning of the immigration act, and wherever that ruling has been made it has only been made in specific cases, in individual cases, and under the circumstances of each individual case as it arose; it has been based upon what has been considered by the department the very decided weight of judicial authority to that effect. Now, while aliens have been admitted—that is to say, persons have been admitted—on the ground that they had acquired a permanent domicile in the United States, so far as I know the question of whether or not the head tax should be collected on account of such persons has never arisen; at least it has not been presented to me. I should say offhand that the head tax had always been collected on account of those aliens, on account of those persons. Possibly it may have been refunded in a few rare instances; as to that I am not advised.

Mr. HAYES. You think, then, that the decision which I have quoted from has not become a rule of the department?

Mr. EARL. It has become a rule of the department to this extent, that wherever in an individual case, under all the circumstances, the Secretary is satisfied that the given alien is a bona fide citizen—I mean a bona fide resident—and that he has never abandoned the domicile acquired in this country, and his absence abroad has been temporary, with the intention of returning, he may, in instances, have let that person in.

Mr. CABLE. Those are very rare instances.

Mr. EARL. The matter comes up in this way: Whether a person has acquired a domicile in the United States or not is a question of fact, and the Secretary has to look into the facts of the case in order to satisfy himself whether the domicile has been acquired, and if it has been acquired whether or not it has been abandoned, and when, as I say, he is perfectly satisfied as to the merits of a case, that the domicile has been acquired and that it has not been abandoned and that the absence was only temporary, he has concluded at times that that person was not an alien within the meaning of the immigration law and was entitled to admission.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. May I read this from decision 117 by Secretary Straus? I am now reading from a decision rendered by the Secretary, dated December 1, 1908, entitled "Decision No. 117," and the part I wish to read is as follows:

It having been repeatedly held by the courts that an alien who has in good faith acquired a permanent domicile in the United States is not precluded by anything in the immigration laws from returning thereto after a temporary absence abroad,

the department has, of course, governed itself accordingly, reserving, however, the necessary discretion and authority to determine in particular cases as they rise whether an alien seeking admission to the United States on the ground of former domicile shall be permitted to enter. To entitle an alien to admission on said ground it must appear that the domicile acquired was a permanent one and has not been abandoned. This is a question of fact to be determined finally by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor.

That has been uniformly followed by the department?

Mr. EARL. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. That does not determine the question as to the payment of the head tax?

Mr. HAYES. I have been advised—and some of you gentlemen can say whether I am correctly advised or not—that where an alien establishes by facts, or satisfies the immigration officers or the department in the case of an appeal, that he has a bona fide residence in the United States and is going to Europe for a temporary purpose, that when he returns the head tax is not collected, but he is treated like a citizen of the United States?

Mr. EARL. I would say this, that the instances in which the department has admitted a person on the ground of prior domicile have been very few; possibly in the course of a year not more than a dozen or two dozen persons have been admitted on that ground.

Mr. HAYES. Then you would say that it is not the uniform practice?

Mr. EARL. By no means.

Mr. BURNETT. You grant them admission, but they must pay the head tax?

Mr. EARL. So far as the head tax is concerned, I should say that the head tax is always collected. I am not sure but that in a few instances it may have been refunded; but that is a matter that would never come to my notice.

Mr. BENNET. Is it not a fact that that decision was based on the case of Buchsbaum, 141 Federal Reporter, affirmed in 152 Federal Reporter, page 346; the case of the United States *v.* Aultman Company, 143 Federal Reporter, 922, affirmed in 148 Federal Reporter, 1022; United States *v.* Nakashima, 160 Federal Reporter, 842, and that there are conflicting decisions commencing with Taylor *v.* United States, 152 Federal Reporter——

Mr. EARL. Which was overruled by the Supreme Court.

Mr. BENNET. And where the court seems rather to confirm the preceding one? And I understand that on the direct question of having acquired a domicile there has not been any decision by the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. EARL. Yes, sir; that is true.

Mr. HAYES. Perhaps some of you gentlemen can enlighten me on another question. I noticed, as I recall, that last year something like between 130,000 and 140,000 aliens must have entered the United States who did not pay any head tax. How did such a discrepancy as that occur?

Mr. EARL. Of course, as solicitor I wouldn't be able to answer that question; so far as I know the head tax is collected of all aliens.

Mr. HAYES. And in the year during which there was the greatest immigration there must have been over 400,000 who did not pay the head tax.

Mr. BENNET. I had that same impression until I spent a day in the Treasury Department and found out about it.

Mr. HAYES. I was referring to the figures as given by the commissioner-general.

Mr. BENNET. The figures given by the commissioner-general are not based on the collection of the entire head tax at all; they are based on different periods—partly on monthly reports, partly on quarterly reports—and one wishing to get these figures correctly must go to the Treasury, sit down in a back room, and go over them as I did.

Mr. HAYES. Can not some of these gentlemen send us those figures?

Mr. BENNET. You can get them at the Treasury Department.

Mr. HAYES. I would like to get those figures.

Mr. BURNETT. Doesn't the Commissioner-General keep a record of all the receipts of head tax?

Mr. BENNET. They go to the Treasury.

Mr. BURNETT. Doesn't he keep a record of the receipts? Doesn't he get that information?

Mr. CABLE. No, sir; the customs officers collect that tax.

Mr. HAYES. Would it be possible to get those figures?

Mr. SOLEAU. They are obtainable.

Mr. HAYES. Would it be possible for you to get them for us without too much trouble?

Mr. SABATH. It would be much easier for the Treasury Department to furnish them.

Mr. BENNET. I move that the Secretary of the Treasury be requested to give us the figures showing the collection of the head tax during each year since June 30, 1906.

(Said motion was seconded by Mr. Hayes, and the question being taken the motion was agreed to.)

It was also moved and seconded that the Secretary of Commerce and Labor be requested to furnish the committee the aggregate, in each of those years, of the aliens admitted into the United States and taxable under the law.

The question was taken and agreed to.)

Mr. BURNETT. That might be a question of construction, as to whether they were taxable.

Mr. HAYES. Let him give us the number of aliens coming in.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. And the number upon which the head tax was paid.

Mr. BENNET. And, separately, the aliens who are exempt under express provisions of the law and those who were exempted, if you can get it, under the regulations of the department. So far as you are aware, is there any regulation, which is new since the 1st of July, 1907, which is not based expressly on statutes, with the exception of that one based on Secretary Root's construction of the statute?

Mr. EARL. No; every regulation is based on statute; from time to time it is necessary to amend them, as we discover omissions, but every regulation is made in conformity with statute, to the best of our ability.

Mr. BENNET. Well, on statutes and on the decisions of the circuit court of appeals, with the single exception of the one that is based on the construction Secretary Root placed on section 1?

Mr. EARL. I do not quite catch the first part of your question.

Mr. BENNET. Well, you drew the regulations?

Mr. EARL. Well, I did, in a way; they were originally prepared by the Bureau of Immigration and they were referred to me for examination before they were printed, and I went over them with as much

care as I could, and some of them I redrafted altogether, and some of them I let stand as they were.

Mr. BENNET. So far as any regulations affecting the head tax are concerned, do you recall any regulation that is not based either on the express words of the statutes, upon the decisions of the circuit courts of appeal, or upon the construction which Secretary Root placed upon the head tax in that one instance.

Mr. EARL. I will answer first "No," and I will add, however, that I do not recall any regulation which is based on the decision of the circuit court of appeals; there is no regulation that I am aware of exempting aliens who have acquired a domicile in the United States from the payment of the head tax, and, furthermore, I ought to say that I do not want to shift the responsibility to Secretary Root for the particular regulation in connection with the payment of the head tax on account of aliens coming in from Canada and Mexico; I suppose I am responsible for that; it was in consequence of my opinion that that regulation was adopted.

Mr. BENNET. And you are going to send us your opinion?

Mr. EARL. Yes.

(At 12 o'clock m. the committee adjourned.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,
Washington, D. C., February 22, 1910.

The committee met at 10.30 o'clock a. m., Hon. Benjamin F. Howell in the chair. Others present were: Representatives Hayes, O'Connell, Goldfogle, Edwards, Burnett, Sabath, Bennet, Johnson, Elvins, and Küstermann.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Mr. HAYES. Let us hear what Mr. Holder has to say.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well; Mr. Holder, we will hear you.

**STATEMENT OF ARTHUR E. HOLDER, LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR.**

Mr. HOLDER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I suppose, for the sake of the record, I had better tell you whom I represent. I am representing in particular the American Federation of Labor this morning and its constituent organizations, and incidentally some of the largest farmers' unions of the United States.

I am not going to burden you with any personal statement, unless I am questioned. I am simply going to ask you to permit me to put into the record the expression of the men who represent our general industrial movement in field and in factory. I believe that by following that method it will at least convince you of this fact, if of no other, that it is the true sentiment of the men who represent others in the general field of labor. It will also be to your advantage, as a matter of conciseness, for, while these papers look bulky, they are written loosely, and it will not be so voluminous when it is in print.

I want to go back a space of five years in order to record the position of organized labor on this great question of immigration, without

unduly burdening you with a great deal of ancient history. At the Pittsburg convention of the American Federation of Labor, held in 1905, this resolution, or this statement, was indorsed:

A further check should be put upon assisted immigration. The law now permits the passage of an alien to be paid by any relative or "friend" living in this country. Every employer who wants to bring in cheap laborers is of course a "friend" to the m, or can find somebody to play the part. It is one of the readiest means of evading the contract-labor law. The privilege of paying the passage of others should be restricted to the nearest relatives—fathers, mothers, and children, brothers and sisters, husbands and wives.

In accordance with the views here outlined, we recommend that you authorize your officers to use all honorable means for the amendment of our immigration laws so as to exclude persons physically unfit, to check the evil of assisted immigration, to introduce an educational test, and to provide that ports of entry shall be confined to those on the Atlantic and Pacific oceans and the Gulf of Mexico.

This resolution was reaffirmed at the Minneapolis convention of 1906.

But there was an additional resolution adopted at the Minneapolis convention upon the subject of Chinese exclusion, which, I believe, would appropriately come before your committee too, and probably you would like to hear what expression was given. It says:

Whereas the grave menace to our institutions—governmental and industrial—which Chinese labor constituted prior to the enactment and enforcement of the Chinese-exclusion law is insignificant when compared with the evils that are certain to follow unrestricted immigration to the United States and its territories of Japanese; and

Whereas official records show that immigration of Japanese to our country is rapidly increasing: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we reaffirm the position on the subject of oriental immigration taken by this federation at its twenty-fifth annual session, as expressed in the following resolutions:

Whereas the menace of Chinese labor, greatly allayed by the passage and enforcement of the Chinese-exclusion act, has been succeeded by an evil similar in general character, but much more threatening in its possibilities, to wit:

The immigration to the United States and its insular territory of large and increasing numbers of Japanese and Korean laborers; and

Whereas American public sentiment against the immigration of Chinese labor, as expressed and crystallized in the enactment of the Chinese-exclusion act, finds still stronger justification in demanding prompt and adequate measures of protection against the immigration of Japanese and Korean labor, on the grounds: (1) That the wage and living standard of such labor are dangerous to and must, if granted recognition in the United States, prove destructive of the American standards in these essential respects; (2) that a racial incompatibility as between the people of the Orient and the United States presents problems of race preservation which it is our imperative duty to solve in our own favor, and which can only be thus solved by a policy of exclusion; and

Whereas the systematic colonization of these oriental races in our insular territory in the Pacific and the threatened and partly accomplished extension of that system to the Pacific coast and other western localities of the United States constitutes a standing danger, not only to the domestic peace, but to the continuance of friendly relations between the nations concerned: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the terms of the Chinese-exclusion act should be enlarged and extended so as to permanently exclude from the United States and its insular territory all classes of Japanese and Koreans, other than those exempted by the present terms of that act; further

Resolved, That these resolutions be submitted through the proper avenues to the Congress of the United States, with a request for favorable consideration and action by that body.

In accordance therewith, I present it to your honorable body for your consideration.

At the Norfolk convention in 1907 the resolution that was passed by the Pittsburg convention of 1905 on the question of illiteracy, or the educational test, was reaffirmed.

In 1908, at Denver, the position of the federation was changed somewhat by the adoption of this resolution:

Whereas foreign steamship interests introduced Senate bill 5083, which would virtually repeal section 42, a much-needed humane provision requiring more air space and better sanitary conditions on immigrant ships; and

Whereas the illiteracy test is the most practical means for the restricting of the present immigration of cheap labor, whose competition is so ruinous: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we earnestly beseech and petition Congress to enact the illiteracy test into law, and to refuse any modification of section 42, unless it be to increase the amount of air space and to require better sanitary accommodations in the steerage.

Mr. BURNETT. That was at what place and in what year?

Mr. HOLDER. That was at Denver, in 1908.

In 1909, last year, the first convention that was held by the federation on foreign soil, in Toronto, Canada, the federation took another step. In previous conventions there had been very vigorous efforts made to have the convention committed to a head tax and to other more rigid restrictions, but that position had never been taken beyond the illiteracy test until 1909, the convention at Toronto. The resolution is short and to the point:

Whereas the illiteracy test is the most practical means for restricting the present stimulated influx of cheap labor, whose competition is so ruinous to the workers already here, whether native or foreign; and

Whereas an increased head tax upon steamships is needed to provide better facilities, to more efficiently enforce our immigration laws, and to restrict immigration; and

Whereas the requirement of some visible means of support would enable immigrants to find profitable employment; and

Whereas the effect of the federal bureau of distribution is to stimulate foreign immigration: Therefore be it

Resolved by the American Federation of Labor in twenty-ninth annual convention assembled, That we demand the enactment of the illiteracy test, the money test, an increased head tax, and the abolition of the distribution bureau; and be it further

Resolved, That we favor heavily fining the foreign steamships for bringing debarable aliens where reasons for debarment could have been ascertained at time of sale of ticket.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. When and where was that resolution adopted?

Mr. HOLDER. At Toronto, in November, 1909.

Now, gentlemen, I have here some resolutions adopted by the Farmers' National Union.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Before you pass on, Mr. Holder, have we not passed some legislation that covers those resolutions, particularly the one about section 42. Did we not do that last year?

Mr. HOLDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAYES. We enlarged the air space, sir.

Mr. HOLDER. You changed the general standard, so as to accommodate the various competitive lines.

Mr. HAYES. We raised the requirements.

Mr. O'CONNELL. You do not mean to say that we did it to accommodate the steamship companies?

Mr. HOLDER. Oh, no; not in that way.

Mr. O'CONNELL. The Senate bill, in my judgment, would have played into the hands of the steamship companies. We amended that.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. One nation had one regulation and another nation had another regulation, and it would be impossible for a steamship company to be able to comply with both regulations; so we changed ours, enlarging the cubic inches of air space to each passenger in such a way as to make it possible to conform with the regulation.

Mr. BENNET. That is not strictly accurate. By section 42 of the act of 1907 we enlarged the requirements. After that the British board of trade adopted the same requirement. The Senate bill corresponded exactly with the British requirements. This committee raised those requirements, and our bill, I think, without any amendment whatever, at least without any substantial amendment, subsequently became the law, increasing the American requirements above the others.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Let me ask Mr. Bennet a question?

Mr. BENNET. Yes.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Have the requirements been complied with?

Mr. BENNET. Yes; and where they are not being complied with, every once in a while an arrest is made and a captain is tried and convicted.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. How many convictions have there been?

Mr. BENNET. My attention was called to two or three.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. How many arrests have there been?

Mr. BENNET. I do not know.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Or complaints?

Mr. BENNET. I am not informed. I know the regulation is being enforced.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Do you think the requirements are ample, or do we need to pass still further statutes to enlarge the air space?

Mr. BENNET. The commission recommended that that particular question be deferred until we have a chance to test the statute now in force.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. That ought to be one of the first steps taken by the commission.

Mr. SABATH. I have prepared a bill on that subject which will cure any and all defects and take care of the things which have been complained of. This bill will give still greater air space, and will take better care of those people who are obliged to travel in steerage. It is bill 18399. A copy of it has been sent to the Bureau of Navigation for information as to its wording and as to the bill in general. The committee asked the bureau to give us its opinion on the bill. I think that has been done. I just saw the Secretary, and he states to me that he has the bill there, and that I will have a report from that bureau on that bill within a few days.

Mr. HOLDER. I would like to include in this general statement, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, two resolutions adopted by the Farmers' National Union that had been submitted to Mr. Gompers for consideration by a labor conference held in the office of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor a year ago. They are pertinent to this general question, and I think it is appropriate that they be brought before your honorable body:

Whereas we are unalterably opposed to the present enormous alien influx, as detrimental to the best interests of the farming communities and the welfare of our whole country: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, in national convention assembled, at Memphis, Tenn., this 8th day of January, 1908, and representing two millions of farmers, urge upon Congress the speedy enactment of laws substantially excluding the present enormous alien influx by means of an increased head tax, a money requirement, the illiteracy test, and other measures, and that we call upon our public and especially our state officials to prevent our agricultural sections from becoming a dumping ground for foreign immigrants.

That was resolution No. 1.

Mr. BURNETT. What is the date of that?

Mr. HOLDER. The 8th day of January, 1908, at Memphis, Tenn.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Are those all southern farmers? They certainly do not come from New York or Wisconsin.

Mr. BURNETT. There are thousands of them in the West.

Mr. HOLDER. They reach above the Ohio River and the far West.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Can you tell us how many there are in this organization?

Mr. HOLDER. These people themselves say they have 2,000,000 of farmers.

Mr. HAYES. The membership has now grown to 3,000,000.

Mr. HOLDER. This resolution refers to their strength a year ago.

Mr. BURNETT. There are a number of them from the West and from the Northwest.

Mr. HOLDER. The other resolution, No. 2, reads as follows:

Whereas foreign immigration is being advocated for southern and western farming communities, the United States Immigration Commission is investigating the subject, and a federal bureau is being established for the purpose of distributing and diverting foreigners;

Whereas the present flagrant lax enforcement of existing immigration laws and the urgent need of additional restrictive legislation will soon result in the agricultural sections in the South and West being made a dumping ground for undesirable south-east European and Asiatic populations: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, in its third annual convention at Fort Worth, Tex., this 3d day of September, 1908, and representing over 2,000,000 farmers, hereby adopts the immigration resolutions passed last January at the annual rally in Memphis, calling for federal and state legislation abolishing immigration bureaus and substantially excluding the present alien influx of cheap labor from southeastern Europe and western Asia, and urge upon federal officials the vigorous enforcement of all immigration laws, in order to properly protect the country's welfare and to preserve its institutions, safeguard its citizenship, and preserve its Anglo-Saxon civilization for posterity; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to each Member of Congress by the chairman of the national legislative committee, with request that they be printed in the Congressional Record, and to the Immigration Commission, with request that they be incorporated in its report; and be it further

Resolved, That the state presidents and lecturers emphasize this one question with a view to having members take it up in conference and by letter with their Congressmen and Senators.

Mr. ADAIR. Let me ask this question——

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. All those resolutions were printed in our hearings, were they not?

Mr. ADAIR. Let me ask this question: Does this class of immigration referred to in these resolutions settle on farms and take to that class of work, or is it not true that they remain to a great extent in the large cities of the country?

Mr. HOLDER. I believe that you have practically answered your own question, in a way. They do remain largely in the cities, but there has been of recent date an effort made to divert that immigration to the West and to the South, and these resolutions from the farmers are evidently a protest against having them.

Mr. ADAIR. Has this effort to any extent been successful?

Mr. HOLDER. I am not able to say. I think the figures in the possession of the Immigration Committee and commission would substantially give you that information.

Mr. ADAIR. Do you think, then, that the fear as expressed in these resolutions by the farming element of the country is well founded?

Mr. HOLDER. Well, I would not care to express an opinion upon that. I think they are better able to voice their own fears than I would be.

Mr. GARDNER. Is not the fact this: When, for a time in 1906, an effort was made to restrict immigration, did not many people say, "The trouble is not with your influx of immigration; the trouble is that it is not properly distributed where it is needed; in other words you do not connect the manless job with the jobless man?"

Mr. HOLDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. GARDNER. And that this suggestion was made—that these bureaus would assist in distributing immigrants where they were needed, and that, as a matter of fact, the bureaus had not had very much effect one way or the other. Now, as a matter of fact, the greatest experiment in distribution that has been made was that made by the State of South Carolina. They received 762 immigrants from Berlin and Belgium and other places, and the result of that experiment was that within a year out of that 762 immigrants all but 72 had disappeared from the State of South Carolina and had gone elsewhere. Some of those had gone back to their own country and others had drifted north, showing quite conclusively that trying to distribute immigration where immigration does not naturally want to be distributed is a farce and is not, in truth, what we are really suffering from. I voted in favor of that distribution bureau merely because I thought it would demonstrate the fact that our trouble was not the lack of distribution. The trouble is that we are getting too many immigrants.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Do you think the South Carolina case to which you have called attention is a fair test?

Mr. GARDNER. I think it is a pretty good example of the fact that you can not make men go where they can only get a dollar a day if they can get a dollar and a half a day somewhere else.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Well, if they could get a dollar and a half a day somewhere else, it would be advantageous both to themselves and to the country to go there. If they looked for better and higher wages, it is rather commendable, is it not?

Mr. GARDNER. They will not stay where the economic conditions are unfavorable to themselves, but they will go where they will get the best pay and the most favorable social conditions. Of course the negro population in the South affects the social conditions.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I asked you whether you did not think it was commendable, as well as justifiable, for a man when he was getting only a dollar in one place to go somewhere else, where he could get a dollar and a half.

Mr. GARDNER. I should prefer that he would not come at all.

Mr. BENNET. In other words, the immigrant is intelligent enough to find out where it is to his best interests to go, and he goes there.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Like every other man.

Mr. ADAIR. Regardless of the amount of compensation that they receive for their services.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Chairman, before Mr. Holder passes on I would like to say that my attention was called to one of the resolutions stating that "Whereas the present flagrant lax enforcement of existing immigration laws" is one of the causes of this immigration that they protest against. I would like to ask Mr. Holder if it is possible for us to receive from this organization any definite details

as to any flagrantly lax enforcement of the immigration laws. My experience at Boston, I might say, has been that immigration laws are very strictly enforced, and I imagine that the experience of every other Member of Congress in the cities where there is immigration is pretty nearly the same.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. It is in New York.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Now, a statement like that, if it is not so, certainly vitiates the whole resolution, if that is one of the principal grounds of protest.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. They have rigidly enforced the immigration laws—in many cases so rigidly that notwithstanding the policy that has been pursued lately in Washington, there have been reversals of the action taken as a result of a special inquiry.

Mr. BURNETT. I saw that one man lost his job up there because he was not enforcing the law.

Mr. ADAIR. Is it not true that the number of men now in the employ of the Government in New York City to enforce the law is not sufficient to take care of the vast number of immigrants arriving in any one day? I see that in some cases 5,000 immigrants arrive in one day, and the force now provided by the Government to take those immigrants in charge have only about two minutes for each examination on the first examination, and only 70 per cent of them are accepted on the first examination. Do you think that a proper examination can be made in two minutes when something like 36 or 38 questions are asked every immigrant that comes in here, and if that is true, is it not a fact that, at least to some extent, there is a little laxity, as is mentioned in this resolution?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I will reply to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SABATH. Can we not thrash that out later, and let the gentleman go on?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Would it be possible for the gentleman to answer my first question?

Mr. GARDNER. I was going to ask the witness if the mere fact that there was an inaccuracy in the wording of the resolution would prove that the American Federation of Labor did not know——

Mr. HOLDER. This is the farmers' organization that adopted this resolution, and while the statement would appear to be extravagant, it voices a general opinion that is prevalent over the length and breadth of our land, that there is a leakage; and while this organization of farmers may not be able to put their finger definitely upon the place where there is a lax enforcement, they are simply representing that sentiment of feeling among their people that the regulations are not enforced according to the laws that you enact.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Let me ask you whether any member of the Farmers' Union, or has the organization itself, any letters of protest or information that would give us specific facts, showing where there has been any flagrant laxity in the enforcement of the existing laws?

Mr. HOLDER. I can offer my services to the best of my ability to secure that information, or this committee could exercise its authority by letting the farmers' organization officials know that this matter has been called to your attention, and that you questioned the statement, and ask them to furnish the proofs.

Mr. BURNETT. I do not question it, because the Immigration Commission can furnish them some proof. Along the Mexican border

there was a systematic traffic going on in the smuggling of Chinese across the border.

Mr. SABATH. I do not believe Mr. O'Connell had reference to the Chinese at all. They do not come through New York at all. He had reference to Boston and New York. I do not suppose any Chinese come through New York.

Mr. HAYES. Yes; they do.

Mr. O'CONNELL. It seems to me that that is such a sweeping charge against the Government itself and against the Department of Commerce and Labor that, as it has appeared before the committee in this form, there ought to be some details and facts to back it up.

Mr. ELVINS. Mr. O'Connell, will you not be willing to allow a little poetic license to a set of resolutions of this kind, just the same as you would allow some poetic license in the platforms of political parties?

Mr. O'CONNELL. I do not like to legislate on poetic licenses.

Mr. HOLDER. Then, gentlemen, if you will permit, let me add this: I do not know that there will be a great deal of progress made, even at this time, by questioning the authenticity or correctness of that statement, as to its being extravagant or not, but let us come to the principle you were considering this morning, as embraced either in Mr. Gardner's bill, No. 15413, or Mr. Hayes's bill, No. 13404.

While we have not made it a practice to commit ourselves to any particular bill unless we have had something to do with the preparation of it, we do want to show our partisanship with regard to the principles contained in a bill.

Mr. Gardner's bill, for a number of years, has been considered a very, very broad one—a humane provision for good citizenship when people arrive here, for the protection of immigrant homes, and for the establishment of a standard that might be pursued with great advantage by other countries when they have some immigration problems to adjust.

Mr. Hayes's bill goes probably a little further. His bill embraces the necessary educational tests of reading and writing in any dialect or language in any European country, and personally I would prefer that to the provision of Mr. Gardner's bill, where he makes the test the ability to read and write in the language or dialect of any country. I think we could safely confine ourselves to Europeans.

The head-tax part of the proposition we look at from an economic standpoint. Some of our people are not altogether wholly in favor of simply charging a head tax upon the alien who comes in the first time. I believe a great many of our people are in favor of making them pay a price for every visitor, whether he goes and returns as a citizen or whether he is a newcomer and has his quarters in the first class, second class, or steerage. We take the ground that it is worth something to come to the United States, and, as a revenue proposition, it would be well worth the consideration of Congress.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Let me ask you this, Mr. Holder——

Mr. HOLDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. You mean you would charge a head tax upon citizens returning to this country who are first or second class passengers on steamships?

Mr. HOLDER. No; I would not be in favor of going that far, but all visitors in those first and second class cabins, as well as steerage passengers, or aliens——

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. No; you spoke of "citizens." Did you mean citizens of this country?

Mr. HOLDER. That might be considered as a secondary proposition later; but that sentiment is abroad, and I am merely representing that sentiment to you.

Mr. GARDNER. If a man comes in here, he shall pay his head tax. If he goes out again without becoming a citizen, if he goes back for the summer, when he comes in again he shall pay his head tax again?

Mr. HOLDER. I mean that as a primary proposition; but from a revenue standpoint, and in order to prevent that leakage that was complained of at the last meeting, where you had so many hundreds of thousands coming in without paying a head tax——

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I understand you to say that you would have a head tax placed upon our own citizens who have gone abroad and who have returned——

Mr. HOLDER. Let me place that squarely with you, Judge. I want to make that thoroughly understood, and there is no reason for evasion——

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Certainly not.

Mr. HOLDER (continuing). Or of making a double meaning out of it. I am telling you now the sentiment of a great many people that I meet, and which has not been crystallized into any definite expression, and that is only one of the ways that you get information, by finding the sentiment of the people whom you meet by what they tell you. I tell you that is the sentiment out in the States, so that you may be prepared for it when you find it yourselves.

Mr. O'CONNELL. You used the word "citizen." Now, I do not suppose the American Federation of Labor wants to go on record as saying that if a citizen happens to travel to another country and comes back he is to be subjected to a head tax?

Mr. HOLDER. I do not think I said that.

Mr. O'CONNELL. You used the word "citizen."

Mr. HOLDER. Yes. That was to convey to you the fact that that sentiment is abroad, but has not been crystallized in any meeting or in any convention, to my knowledge.

Mr. O'CONNELL. It would probably prevent all traveling outside of this country.

Mr. BURNETT. He does not say the position of the American Federation of Labor is such.

Mr. ADAIR. It would hardly prevent traveling on the part of a man who has the means to travel. Such a man would be able to pay the tax. Anyone who is financially able to visit the Old World would, if necessary, pay the \$4. However, I do not wish to be understood as favoring such a tax at this time.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Take the case of the American Federation of Labor. They held their convention in Toronto last year, and those same men would have to pay a head tax in order to come back to this country.

Mr. HOLDER. Do not misunderstand me, Mr. O'Connell and gentlemen of the committee, that I have reported to you this morning that the American Federation of Labor was in favor of that. I have tried to represent to you the sentiments of people that I meet away out in the States, who are quite exercised over this question. It means their life, it means their happiness, and they look at it sometimes from a very prejudiced standpoint. They do not see you to

tell you that, but we fellows who are representing the labor organizations, when we go into their homes and meetings and gatherings, they do not hesitate to express their views to us. They may express them crudely at times, but they are given in a very forcible way, and I thought I would present that phase of this question at least to you this morning.

Mr. SABATH. While a tax should be collected, and is collected, the law provides that any alien must pay a head tax, whether he travels in the steerage or second cabin or first cabin. If there is any leakage we are to ascertain where it is, and if there is any shortage we are to ascertain where it is.

Mr. BURNETT. I understand that does not embrace returning aliens.

Mr. SABATH. Every alien, as I understand, pays the tax.

Mr. BENNET. I have a letter here from Ormsby McHarg——

Mr. SABATH. There were only ten or twelve exceptions last year.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. If they went abroad with the intention of returning——

Mr. HOLDER. Now, gentlemen, if I may be permitted, there is another phase of this immigration proposition that I would like to present to you from one of our organizations. This comes from the musicians, who have had a grievance for several years——

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. That is my trade.

Mr. HOLDER. You may be in sympathy with this, then.

This was adopted at the Toronto convention, at the solicitation of the musicians of the United States, and I hope that Mr. Küstermann will be able to find that there is an opportunity for him to champion the members of his own craft.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Let us hear what they say.

Mr. HOLDER. (Reading):

Whereas the American musician is in no wise protected by the alien contract labor law, and the lack of such protection leaves him subjected to cheap foreign competition; and

Whereas the French Opera Company of New Orleans, La., has imported an alien orchestra, thus displacing American musicians; and

Whereas before such importation was effected a proposition was made to the American Federation of Musicians, through its local union in New Orleans, to submit to a cut in wages, which is proof sufficient that the importation of said orchestra was made by the French Opera Company to avoid the paying of the established wages to American musicians; and

Whereas information has been received to the effect that the management of the Land and Irrigation Exposition in Chicago, Ill., has succeeded in securing the services of a Mexican band through the courtesy of President Diaz of Mexico, free of costs, excepting transportation and board; and

Whereas the allegations of promoters that the importing of musicians is a necessity for the reason that fully qualified musicians to fill all engagements can not be procured in this country are untrue, as for a matter of fact fully qualified American musicians are continually out of employment: therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention go on record protesting against the importation of all alien bands and orchestras as unjust, and only made by the promoters for the purpose of evading the paying of the American scale of wages: and be it further

Resolved, That the executive council be hereby instructed to call the matter to the attention of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, and take such other steps as in their judgment will result in the amending of the alien contract-labor law for the protection of the American musicians against the importation of foreign bands and orchestras.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. So that means that all artists are to be kept out of this country, and that we are to be exposed to all the discords furnished by some of our American bands.

Mr. GOLDSFOGLE. This has reference to both artists and nonartists.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. It is one of the most unjust things I have heard of, to not allow a man to come in here who is doing something to promote art in this country. If your resolutions all run along that line, I tell you that it would have been best for you not to have introduced them. I have heard Italian and Mexican bands in Milwaukee and Chicago. It was a great treat, and there are no bands anywhere in this country that furnish more artistic music. Now, the idea of keeping out those people is an outrage. Let the artists come in.

Mr. HAYES. You misinterpret the resolution. The resolution does not ask to keep them out. It asks you to prevent them from being brought in under contract.

Mr. HOLDER. Free immigration has not been provided against, Mr. Küstermann.

Mr. ADAIR. They do not charge that you should keep any of your friends from Hamburg from coming here, Mr. Küstermann.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Well, we will see. But really that resolution is going too far, and it is a good thing that you have gone that far, because it is an eye-opener for other unjust things for which you are asking.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Possibly, Mr. Küstermann, the resolution does not express just what these men want. I do not understand it to mean that they are against artists or the representatives of high art. I understand that it was to prevent musicians from coming in here for the purpose of cutting the wages now received by American musicians. Possibly there is something in common between you, and there is a misunderstanding. I should say it was for the purpose of preventing a violation of the contract law. Is that the idea?

Mr. HOLDER. Absolutely, Mr. O'Connell. And I think that if Mr. Küstermann would kindly read that resolution carefully himself, he would see it as we do. Possibly I did not read it with such clearness that I was able to make myself understood.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. We want all the good musicians here that we can secure. There is nothing that does more for the people in general than music.

Mr. HOLDER. I do not think, from my reading of that resolution, that there has been the least disposition to curb art or to restrain harmony; but there is an economic request in there, that the man who is able to play and to charm another and to relieve sadness or to give entertainment, shall be properly compensated for what he does, and I believe you will stand by that.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I think they generally insist upon that.

Mr. HOLDER. But here is a case where the musicians have come to Congress repeatedly, for years, asking them for protection, and that is all I am asking for them to-day.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I want to know what kind of musicians are asking for that protection?

Mr. HOLDER. Here is a body of 60,000 men who are the cream of the artists in the United States. The point to determine is, whether they deserve this protection which is asked.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. The Mexican Government was ready and willing to assist all they could to make the Land and Irrigation Exposition in Chicago a success, and this musicians' organization finds fault with the generosity of Mexico in furnishing these excellent musicians free

of expense. You could not get a band of 50 or 100 artists to come here without making some previous arrangement or contract. They must have arrangements made for their tour, the same as an actor or actress does. It is perfectly proper.

Mr. HOLDER. That general subject-matter, Mr. Küstermann, is open for the rigid investigation of this committee, and if there is injustice being performed, I believe you are the men to find out where the injustice is, and rectify it. That is all we are asking for.

Mr. BURNETT. I understood a while ago that they did not usually come over under contracts.

Mr. SABATH. This Mexican band did not.

Mr. HOLDER. That is one of the most recent incidents, but the musicians of our country have had a standing grievance against that method of procedure, and I believe they are justified in making their protest and asking me to bring it before you.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. And these men do not want the members of the Marine Band to play anywhere except for governmental functions. That is wrong. Why don't we give the people of the United States a chance to hear them as much as possible?

Mr. HOLDER. When it comes to a question of bread and butter, Mr. Küstermann, it is liable to make any man go the limit.

Mr. O'CONNELL. It seems to me that the first part of that resolution, about New Orleans, is a violation of the alien contract law.

Mr. BENNET. I looked that up. They came in as artists.

Mr. HOLDER. That is one of the evasive methods that is used to get them in. They come in as artists.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I wish I were on that commission to find out whether a man is really an artist or not, and to keep him out if he is not.

Mr. HAYES. Let us hear Mr. Holder now.

Mr. HOLDER. I have practically gotten through with what I had to offer. If any gentleman has any questions to ask, I will be glad to answer them.

Mr. SABATH. What is the pay of ordinary musicians?

Mr. HOLDER. Well, I could not tell you that, Mr. Sabath, because I do not know one note from another, and I never associated with a musician.

Mr. SABATH. How much do they charge an hour?

Mr. O'CONNELL. They charge enough to get in to hear them; I will tell you that.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Keliher, a Member of the House, is here and wants to be heard.

Mr. KELIHER. I do not care to be heard to-day.

Mr. GARDNER. Does that gentleman over there want to be heard?
(No response.)

The CHAIRMAN. We are very much indebted to you for coming here, Mr. Holder.

Mr. HOLDER. I would like to say this, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the courtesy that has been accorded me in representing the great body of men that I do. Doubtless I have been somewhat weak in the presentation of my case, but in case any measure or any question should come up in the future, and you will let me know, and if I can get the information for you, I would be very glad to. I believe that this is a question of enlightenment. Just as soon as we find out what the trouble is, our people are going to find a solution of the problem.

Mr. SABATH. Will you please tell us what the membership is of this Farmers' Union and how many members it has in each State?

Mr. HOLDER. I would have to give you that, Mr. Sabath, in a general way. I have not had very much contact with the farmers. I was only at a couple of their meetings, and had no opportunity to get detailed information. I know that in Texas, Arkansas, California, Oregon, Washington, and in the Northwest, coming down through Montana, in Nebraska, the two Dakotas, touching Iowa, into Missouri and Kansas, it is very, very strong, and then as we come across the Mississippi River into the southeast section of the country they are very strong. They have not got north of the Ohio River to any great extent. I believe that is where the Grange, as a whole, is the most numerous. There will be a convention of all these interests on March 6 in Chicago, where the Grange, the Farmers' National Union, and the American Society of Equity will be present. They are the three largest organizations that are looking after the interests of the farmers cooperatively and industrially.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. What does the American Society of Equity represent?

Mr. HOLDER. That is an organization that is looking after the grain, cotton, and tobacco interests. The railroad organizations, constituting the brotherhoods, and the American Federation of Labor represent the trade industries. They are going to have a conference with the farmers' organizations on March 6 in Chicago, upon legislative propositions, and will present them before Congress. Immigration, I presume, will be one of the questions.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Can you tell us, Mr. Holder, at the present time how much part unskilled labor plays in the deliberations of the American Federation of Labor? What I am trying to get at is to find out whether they are looking after the skilled labor of this country or the unskilled labor.

Mr. HOLDER. I am glad you asked me that question, Mr. O'Connell. It was a phase that I had intended to touch upon extemporaneously, and if I had prompted you to ask me that it could not have come in more appropriately.

The American Federation of Labor, gentlemen, occupies a most unique position in the economic, industrial, and social affairs of our nation. It is the only body of organized effort that takes the raw material as it is landed upon our shores and attempts to assimilate it, to mold it, to teach it to become American citizens, to stand for an American standard of living. None of the fraternal organizations or political organizations pays any heed to that great host, averaging seven or eight hundred thousand or a million a year that are coming to our shores; but the American Federation of Labor goes to them with open hands, and it says, "Brother, come with us, and we will, if we can and you will permit us, make your lot in life happier." And in that connection, gentlemen, we realize that we have got a herculean task, and sometimes it looks like a hopeless one. We are not a financial institution. Our organization is simply supported by a half cent a month per capita from the members. Six lone cents a year is all we pay into our treasury, and out of that our missionaries or organizers or agitators—call them whatever name you please—have to be supported to carry on this work and this doctrine of self-help to the newcomers.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Just one minute. I see in the report of the immigration commissioner of New York that the great majority of the federated organizations do not take any aliens as members. They do not seem to be stretching out their hands——

Mr. HOLDER. Where did you get that information, Mr. Küstermann?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I have not that report with me. I left it in my room. That report states that the majority of them do not accept aliens. They must be citizens of the United States before they admit them. So they have got to be molded before you commence your molding.

Mr. HOLDER. I am glad you brought that to my mind, too, because that also leaves an opportunity for explanation; but before taking that up, Mr. Küstermann, let me answer, in a few words, the direct question of Mr. O'Connell, in which he asked whether our organizations simply nurse the skilled trades at the expense of the unskilled. I want to answer that tersely and to the point, that our doors are open to all who work with their hands, whether they are of American birth, American citizens by naturalization, or whether they come from any land, from any clime. We know no race, no sect, no sex, no nationality. Now, what broader claim to the brotherhood of man do you want than that?

Now, I would like to reply directly to what Mr. Küstermann has asked, and I will say that there is one organization that says that a man must be a citizen before he is admitted as a member, and I will tell you the reason why, if you will permit me.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. There were several in that report.

Mr. HOLDER. Well, there is one, and that is the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, and the reason for that provision—if you will bear a little with me, so that you will grasp the whole of it—is because there is an English organization named the amalgamated carpenters in the United States, and the brotherhood, which is the American organization, has made it one of its provisions that it wants the members of the amalgamated to take out citizenship papers before they join that organization. That is all there is to that. It is not narrow. If there is any other organization that has a like provision I have never learned of it, and if I do learn of it, I will investigate the matter further.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I will look that up.

Mr. BENNET. I think you made a very broad claim when you said that nobody else is looking after the interests of immigrants. The church of which I have the honor to be a member does that, and there are a great many Jewish organizations that look after the immigrants. There are some Polish, Swedish, Italian, German, possibly 25 or 30 organizations in New York City alone whose business it is to minister to the newly arrived immigrant. I do not think you meant to exclude them in your statement.

Mr. HOLDER. Certainly not.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I would not be doing my duty at all if I did not call your attention to the fact, Mr. Holder, that there is in my city, New York, as well as, to my knowledge, in a great many other places throughout the United States, a number of organizations who give their whole attention to the immigrants, look to their Americanization, and seek to obtain for them a profitable employment at wages

not incompatible with the standard of wages that obtains among men of the federation. These organizations give attention to the poor and needy, and in other directions help the immigrant in the ways that you so eloquently stated the federation did for the men who came to this country from abroad. I can mention a number of these organizations. Some of them I have been personally connected with; in some I have been a director, and in some I have stood at the head. I do not think, Mr. Holder, you meant to be unjust to those organizations. I am afraid you made your statement a little broad.

Mr. HOLDER. Positively, I did not intend to exclude them, nor do or say a single word that would bring reflection or reproach on any class.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. For instance, in my own district we have a sheltering home for immigrants, and we have a number of other immigrant institutions, the managements of which have given splendid attention to the needs of the immigrant class, and have done an immense amount of work toward the Americanization of the immigrant and toward helping him to become assimilated with the Americans and to adopt American habits and customs and mode of life, and to enable him to reach a state when he would not only be helpful to himself but helpful to his fellow-men and to become prosperous in the community.

Mr. HOLDER. That is admittedly true, Judge.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. That is equally so with regard to organizations such as the Independent Order Brith Abraham, the Order Brith Abraham, United Hebrew Charities, the Irish Immigrant Society, and Italian societies, and societies of other nationalities and creeds.

Mr. O'CONNELL. I understand that the same societies are doing the same kind of work in the city of Boston.

Mr. SABATH. And I want to state that the same societies are doing that work in Chicago, and the Bohemian and Polish people in that city are also taking care of and looking after new arrivals.

Mr. HOLDER. But the point that I want to make, and I hope that I can clearly make it, is that the American Federation of Labor, knowing no creed, nationality, or race, opens its doors wide and invites the immigrants to socially mix with each other. The organizations you have referred to do not do that as generously, I do not think; and we know this, that from a cosmopolitan standpoint, where the opportunity is afforded to exercise all of the intelligent effort for the bettering of human life, we are filling a position in society that is very much needed and should be encouraged. I believe I make myself clear in that.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I simply did not want the statement, which, I believe, you have conceded to be too broad, to go unchallenged. There are many organizations who are doing this good, charitable work that goes to the Americanization of the man who comes from abroad to build a home for himself here.

Mr. HOLDER. We hail with delight, Judge, any effort made of that character, either on secular lines, fraternal lines, industrial lines, social lines, or any other lines that will make for the uplift of men, and we are trying to do our part.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Is not the great majority of the American Federation of Labor composed of the highly skilled labor of this country?

Mr. HOLDER. Well, I would reply to that in the affirmative, Mr. O'Connell; but it is not our fault.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Oh, I think it is to your credit.

Mr. HOLDER. That is not our fault. We do not say to a man who is not skilled, "You shall not come in." We say, "Come, and you shall share equally with us." But we do also admit that the cream of the industrial workers of the United States is in our organization.

Mr. SABATH. And the aim has been to increase and enlarge?

Mr. HOLDER. To make better; yes, sir.

Mr. ADAIR. And they all have the same opportunity to work their way up in the organization?

Mr. HOLDER. Sure, absolutely. There is no restriction. I hand for the record the following extract from the *Il Giornale Italiano*.

[Extract from *Il Giornale Italiano*, Thursday, February 3, 1910.]

FOR FREE IMMIGRATION—AN IMPORTANT MEETING.

Mr. N. Behar, administrative director of the National Immigration League, of which Hon. Edward Lauterbach is the president, has sent to the foreign newspapers which are published in America a circular, which we herewith translate:

"Immigration is in peril. Besides the measures of the Hayes law, many others have been presented to Congress, all with the intention of the restriction, or rather the abolition, of immigration. The incessant and energetic propaganda of the restrictionists has borne its fruits even among liberally disposed people. These say that it is necessary to give some satisfaction to such persistent demands. Some would consent to the educational test, others to the head tax of \$25, and many have decided to recommend the approval of the Hayes law with modifications. It is time that the newspapers representing the foreign colonies—which naturally are most immediately interested in immigration—should organize in a solid body to oppose the forces of the restrictionists in the present session of Congress, and, to take away the power of the restrictionists in the future, should do whatever is in their power to impress on the minds of their immigrants the fact that they must do honor to the race to which they belong, wherever they may be."

Mr. Behar has called for Monday, the 7th instant, at 4 p. m., in the office of the American Association of Foreign Newspapers, room 712, World Building, a meeting of all the editors of foreign newspapers to discuss the most efficacious means of propaganda against the proposed abolitionist measures.

We are in perfect sympathy with this movement, promoted by the National Liberal Immigration League, and we promise to do all in our power to promote the benefit of our immigration.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Simon Wolf, of Washington, and Dr. Cyrus Adler, and some other gentlemen, who have made the subject of immigration a study, and who have had a very large experience in matters affecting immigration, desire to be heard by this committee. I have been communicated with by some of the gentlemen and have been asked to have a day set when these gentlemen and others who represent like interests may be heard. May I now ask to have a time set when these gentlemen, or some of them, can come before this committee?

The CHAIRMAN. Would you name any time when you would like to have them come here?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. So far as Mr. Wolf and Mr. Adler are concerned, you may anticipate very brief statements. Mr. Wolf is an old, experienced hand at addressing committees. Doctor Adler was the librarian of the Smithsonian Institution, and they are experienced and understand the necessity of being brief and presenting their arguments with clearness.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us fix Friday, the 11th of March, at 10.30 o'clock a. m., as a time to hear those gentlemen.

(Thereupon, at 12.05 o'clock p. m., the committee adjourned until Tuesday, March 1, 1910, at 10.30 o'clock a. m.)

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,
House of Representatives, February 28, 1910.

A meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization was held Monday afternoon, February 28, 1910, at 3 p. m., to receive a delegation representing the editors and publishers of 350 newspapers published in 24 different foreign languages. The members of the delegation were introduced to the chairman, Representative Howell, and the members of the committee by Mr. Louis N. Hammerling, president of the American Association of Foreign Newspapers. Others present at the meeting were Representatives Elvins, Küstermann, and Moore, of Texas.

Mr. Hammerling filed the following communication with the chairman of the committee:

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE NEWSPAPERS,
 NEW YORK CITY.

The CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: The delegation before you is a committee duly elected by the editors and publishers of 350 daily and weekly newspapers published in 24 different foreign languages in the United States. These newspapers reach a population of over 14,000,000 people, most of whom are American citizens.

I have been chosen as their spokesman, to express their disapproval of certain bills offered in Congress designed to impose what we consider an unfair and an unnecessary burden upon immigrants.

These bills have for their purpose an increase in the per capita tax and the imposition of an educational test upon the immigrant.

We have no objection to the restriction of such immigration as in the wisdom of our lawmakers may appear undesirable.

We do object to the legislation in question, because it goes outside of the experience of this nation in the admission of immigrants, and we insist that there is an absence of fair-mindedness in the conception of the purposes embodied in these bills.

An increase in the head tax upon the immigrant is a tax imposed upon an individual the least able of any to bear it, because of the expense of a long journey and the demand made upon him in the shape of a provision for those who may be left behind, which in itself is an exceptional financial strain. The Government of the United States can not justify this tax on the ground of raising revenue, because the nation is too rich and too strong to levy an exaction upon those the least able to bear the burden. When viewed in this light such a tax must be considered for the purpose of restricting the coming of the immigrant.

We respectfully submit that a condition has not yet arisen in this country when the dictates of good governmental policy require the restriction of desirable immigrants. The vast undeveloped area in this country when worked by the hands of the worthy immigrant coming to these shores will add enormously to the wealth of the nation.

In our opinion there is neither historical nor practical justification for legislation which has for its purpose the imposition of an educational test upon the immigrant. We feel that the reasons advanced by the advocates of such legislation are based upon a most superficial examination of the circumstances which induce illiteracy on the part of the immigrant. We insist that the lack of general education on the part of the immigrant is due to the absence of popular school systems in the countries from which the immigrants come. This is peculiarly the case with the south of Europe and Russia. It is not long ago that the same complaint was being made about the immigrants from the north of Europe. This condition has been overcome. Schools have been provided in the north European countries, and to-day there is but little more illiteracy there than is found in the United States.

We respectfully submit that an impediment that goes no deeper than the lack of an education sufficient to meet the test imposed by the advocates of the educational test can readily be overcome. All that is needed for this purpose is a public school and an opportunity to attend it. The mental strength of the immigrant is equal to that of native Americans. Their children acquire a knowledge of how to read and write the English language as readily as our own. The schools and colleges of the country show what the children of the immigrant can do when given a chance. The

great trials which go to make character have produced in mankind a mental development rendering it comparatively easy to acquire an ordinary education.

We would respectfully ask you, Mr. Chairman, to use your great influence in opposition to this proposed unjust change in our present laws, to the proper enforcement of which we have no objection. In making this request of you we wish to assure you that we have given this matter the consideration that patriotic Americans should give to a matter that goes so deeply into what can be termed "the welfare of the country."

We offer in support of this conclusion the record of the enthusiasm and patriotism of the immigrants who have played such a great part in making this country what it is.

We call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to a few of the important facts which we know:

(1) Sixty-five per cent of the farmers owning farms and working as farm laborers are people who came from Europe during the last thirty years.

(2) Of the 890,000 miners, mining the coal to operate the great industries, 630,000 are our people.

(3) Of the 580,000 steel and iron workers employed in the different plants throughout the United States, 69 per cent, according to the latest statistics of the steel and iron industries, are our people.

(4) Ninety per cent of the labor employed for the last thirty years in building the railways has been furnished by our immigrant people, who are now keeping the same in repair.

Mr. Chairman, these facts alone should convince any American citizen of the desirability of getting in the healthy and willing workers, in order to help develop this great country of ours.

LOUIS N. HAMMERLING, *President.*

The committee of editors was as follows: L. N. Hammerling, president American Association of Foreign Newspapers, chairman; E. M. Grella, *Girinale Italiano*, secretary; G. H. Berg, *Nordstjernan*, treasurer; F. L. Frugone, *Bollettino della Sera*; V. J. Valjavec, *Glas Naroda*; L. F. Wazeter, *Tygodnik Polski*; N. A. Morkazel, *Al-Hoda*; D. J. Vlasto, *Atlantis*; Rev. C. L. Orbach, *Slovak V. Amerike*; Jos. A. Werwinski, *Goniec Polski*; N. Behar, *National Liberal Immigration League*; H. Berlin, *Federation of Jewish Organizations of New York State*; Dr. A. Kozma, *Szabadsag*; Dr. Walter J. Briggs, *Austria*; Dr. E. L. Lucaciu, *Romanul in America*; Thomas Piptone, *Italian Magazine*; A. Capparucci, *Opinione*; John Vicario, *Araldo Italiano*; L. Kamaiky, *Jewish Daily News*; J. Seperrnstein, *Jewish Morning Journal*; G. D. Berko, *Amerikai Magyar Nepszava*; L. E. Miller, *Jewish Daily Warheit*.

The resolutions filed were:

RESOLUTIONS UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED AT A MEETING OF THE PUBLISHERS OF FOREIGN-LANGUAGE NEWSPAPERS OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF FOREIGN NEWSPAPERS, HELD AT THE OFFICE OF THE ASSOCIATION, WORLD BUILDING, NEW YORK, N. Y., ON THE 23D DAY OF FEBRUARY, 1910.

Whereas immigration has been a great factor in populating the United States, developing its resources, and building up its manufacturing intertests; and

Whereas immigrants are still needed in the development of the South and West, in furnishing labor to the manufacturing plants in the East, and in providing farm hands and domestic servants throughout the United States; and

Whereas there are at present several bills before Congress, especially the Hayes and Overman bills, aiming at the restriction of immigration; and

Whereas the immigration problem is mainly a problem of distributing aliens to sections of the country, mainly to farm districts, where their services are needed; and

Whereas the Hayes bill, in addition to stringent restrictive measures, proposes also the repeal of sections 26 and 40 of the immigration act of 1907, which provide, respectively, for the admission under bond of certain aliens liable to deportation, and for the establishment of the Division of Information in the Department of Commerce and Labor, having for its purpose the proper distribution of aliens and unemployed; and

Whereas the restrictive measures proposed in the above-mentioned bills have for their purpose:

(1) To provide an educational test, which in many instances would exclude strong and healthy laborers.

- (2) An increase of the head tax.
- (3) Exclusion of all male aliens over 16 years of age who do not possess \$25.
- (4) Exclusion of all unmarried or widowed females over 18 years of age who do not possess \$25.
- (5) The requirement of a certificate of permission from the government of which the alien seeking admission to this country is a subject, which permission, owing to the known unwillingness of the European countries to lose their strong and healthy citizens, will rarely be given.

Whereas if any or several of these restrictive measures should become law, immigration to this country will not be merely checked, but practically prohibited; and

Whereas we stand unqualifiedly in favor of such legislation as has for its purpose the exclusion of morally and physically undesirable immigrants; and

Whereas existing laws are sufficient in order to bar out undesirable aliens: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Association of Foreign Newspapers, representing over 300 newspapers of 24 foreign tongues published in the United States, protests against any further restriction of immigration, and against the passage of any act that will have for its purpose the abolition of the Division of Information, or any interference with it in any other way than to strengthen it and enlarge its powers; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be presented to the President of the United States and to the Vice-President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, and to the chairmen of the Committees on Immigration of the Senate and House of Representatives, by a specially designated delegation of the American Association of Foreign Newspapers.

L. N. Hammerling, president American Association of Foreign Newspapers, New York, N. Y.

Frank W. Misuraca, secretary American Association of Foreign Newspapers, New York, N. Y.

N. Behar, managing director National Liberal Immigration League, New York, N. Y.

H. Berlin, financial secretary Federation of Jewish Organizations of New York State, New York, N. Y.

B. Aquilano, La Follia di New York, Italian, New York, N. Y.

V. J. Valjavec, Glas Naroda, Slovenic, New York, N. Y.

Thomas Piptone, Italian Magazine, Italian, New York, N. Y.

Walter J. Briggs, Austria, Austrian, New York, N. Y.

Dr. A. Kozma, Amerikai Magyar Nepszava, Hungarian, New York, N. Y.

A. A. Paryski, Ameryka Echo, Polish, Toledo, Ohio.

John Welsand, Dziennik Polski, Polish, Detroit, Mich.

Frank Bonczae, Straz, Polish, Scranton, Pa.

John R. Palandech, United Servian, Servian, Chicago, Ill.

V. Terracciano, Forbice, Italian, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. B. Lange, Scandia, Norwegian-Danish, Chicago, Ill.

J. V. Loanovici, America, Roumanian, Cleveland, Ohio.

F. A. Toth, Slovenske Noviny, Slovak, Hazleton, Pa.

P. S. Lambros, Greek Star, Greek, Chicago, Ill.

C. Ebbesw, Osterns Harold, Swedish, New Britain, Conn.

M. Mastrogiovanni, Patria, Italian, Chicago, Ill.

J. A. Harpet, New York Uutiset, Finnish, Brooklyn, N. Y.

J. Bruno, Mastro Paolo, Italian, Philadelphia, Pa.

W. Molesynski, Gazeta Buffaloska, Polish, Buffalo, N. Y.

M. Vivag, Szabad Sajto, Hungarian, Passaic, N. J.

C. Thurstone, Skandia, Swedish, Jamestown, N. Y.

V. Talamini, La Liberta, Italian, Providence, R. I.

K. Obecny, Gazeta Tygodniowa, Polish, Schenectady, N. Y.

J. Lussie, La Justice, French, Holyoke, Mass.

J. S. Bernier, Avenir National, French, Manchester, N. H.

O. Thibault, L'Independant, French, Fall River, Mass.

G. Boberg, Svenska Tribunen-Nyheter, Swedish, Chicago, Ill.

S. R. Guarino, Libero Pensiero, Italian, Birmingham, Ala.

M. J. Knape, Texas Posten, Swedish, Austin, Tex.

J. Stehlik, Slavie, Bohemian, Racine, Wis.

S. A. Xanthaky, Panhellenic, Greek, New York, N. Y.

V. G. Nowak, Czas, Polish, Brooklyn, N. Y.

H. Chiariglione, Unione, Italian, Pueblo, Colo.

F. Lepore, Nazione, Italian, Denver, Colo.

P. Olbi, Roma, Italian, Denver, Colo.

L. C. Frank, New Yorske Listy, Bohemian, New York, N. Y.

- P. O. Thorfon, Normanden, Norwegian-Danish, Grand Forks, N. Dak.
 G. Mapelli, Capitale, Italian, Denver, Colo.
 A. Novak, Domacnost, Bohemian, Milwaukee, Wis.
 A. Steele, Svensk-Amerikanska Western, Swedish, Denver, Colo.
 T. Passerini, Sole, Italian, Bridgeport, Conn.
 Vac. Buresh, Cesko-Americky Farmer, Bohemian, Omaha, Nebr.
 Vac. Buresh, Pokrok Zapadu, Bohemian, Omaha, Nebr.
 Vac. Buresh, Cretesky Pokrok, Bohemian, Crete, Nebr.
 Vac. Buresh, Kansasky Pokrok, Bohemian, Wilson, Kans.
 Vac. Buresh, Pokrok, Bohemian, Schuyler, Nebr.
 Vac. Buresh, Dakotsky Pokrok, Bohemian, Tyndall, S. Dak.
 Vac. Buresh, Iowsky Pokrok, Bohemian, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
 Vac. Buresh, Minnesotsky Pokrok, Bohemian, St. Paul, Minn.
 A. G. Johnson, Svenska Folkets Tidning, Swedish, Minneapolis, Minn.
 J. S. Kruszka, Dziennik Narodowy, Polish, Chicago, Ill.
 L. Terrone, Il Vesuvio, Italian, Philadelphia, Pa.
 C. J. Pearson, Skandinavia, Swedish, Worcester, Mass.
 F. A. Sueuson, Kansas City Tribunen, Swedish, Kansas City, Mo.
 A. Xuijo, Paivalehti, Finnish, Calumet, Mich.
 L. B. Haduch, Wielkopolanin, Polish, Pittsburg, Pa.
 E. Ljima, Luce, Italian, Utica, N. Y.
 A. Xuijo, Amerikan Uutiset, Finnish, Calumet, Mich.
 K. W. Bartos, Hospodar, Bohemian, Omaha, Nebr.
 K. W. Bartos, Cesko Slovansky Obzor, Bohemian, Omaha, Nebr.
 K. W. Bartos, Osveta Americka, Bohemian, Omaha, Nebr.
 F. Marta, La Nostra Terra, Italian, Hurley, Wis.
 K. W. Bartos, Kansaske Rozhledy, Bohemian, Wilson, Kans.
 K. W. Bartos, Minnesotske Noviny, Bohemian, St. Paul, Minn.
 K. W. Bartos, Cesky Obzor, Bohemian, Omaha, Nebr.
 K. W. Bartos, Wilberske Listy, Bohemian, Omaha, Nebr.
 K. W. Bartos, Rozhledy, Bohemian, Omaha, Nebr.
 R. Benedetto, Sentinella del West Virginia, Italian, Thomas, W. Va.
 G. Gallina, Sentinella, Italian, Hoboken, N. J.
 S. J. Turnblad, Svenska Amerikanska Posten, Swedish, Minneapolis, Minn.
 J. Anderson, Skandinaven, Norwegian-Danish, Chicago, Ill.
 F. E. Chudotsik, Katolicke Slovenske Noviny, Slovak, Chicago, Ill.
 W. Wolizynski, Polonia, Polish, Detroit, Mich.
 Prof. C. Baucia, Il Vessillo, Italian, Baltimore, Md.
 M. S. Paruch, Nowiny Polske, Polish, Milwaukee, Wis.
 M. S. Paruch, Tygodnik Polski, Polish, Milwaukee, Wis.
 W. Missell, Wedrowiec, Polish, Buffalo, N. Y.
 S. Michelson, Keleivis, Lithuanian, Boston, Mass.
 C. F. Settoske, Telegraf, Polish, Chicago, Ill.
 C. Giorre, Montagna, Italian, Newark, N. J.
 S. Bulsiewicz, Kronika, Polish, Newark, N. J.
 P. Matullo, Ora, Italian, Newark, N. J.
 M. A. Pacilli, Internazionale, Italian, Schenectady, N. Y.
 J. Lunghino, Corriere Italiano, Italian, Buffalo, N. Y.
 W. Boczkowski, Saule, Lithuanian, Mahanoy City, Pa.
 J. Lanzella, Risveglio Coloniale, Italian, Syracuse, N. Y.
 B. Mazzotta, Gazzetta di Paterson, Italian, Paterson, N. J.
 F. Curzio, Eco del Rhode Island, Italian, Providence, R. I.
 M. Kenningsen, Nordlyset, Norwegian-Danish, Brooklyn, N. Y.
 J. A. Di Silvestro, Voce del Popolo, Italian, Philadelphia, Pa.
 H. Hammerstad, Nordisk Tidende, Norwegian-Danish, Brooklyn, N. Y.
 V. Scalco, Maschere, Italian, Baltimore, Md.
 J. Slik, Polak Amerykanski, Polish, Buffalo, N. Y.
 A. Truhow, Svea, Swedish, Worcester, Mass.
 A. Sordi, Nostri Tempi, Italian, Pittsburg, Pa.
 J. Donnarumo, Gazzetta del Mass, Italian, Boston, Mass.
 Wm. Wendt, Przyjacieli Ludu, Polish, Philadelphia, Pa.
 G. H. Berg, Nordstjernen, Swedish, New York, N. Y.
 E. M. Grella, Giornale Italiano, Italian, New York, N. Y.
 E. Cantelmo, Cronaca Illustrata, Italian, New York, N. Y.
 E. Cantelmo, Vita Internazionale, Italian, New York, N. Y.
 J. Horvath, Szabdsag, Hungarian, Cleveland, Ohio.
 D. J. Vlasto, Atlantis, Greek, New York, N. Y.
 F. L. Frugone, Bollettione della Sera, Italian, New York, N. Y.

N. A. Mokarzel, Al-Hoda, Arabic, New York, N. Y.	John Vicario, Telegrafo, Italian, New York, N. Y.
C. L. Orbach, Slovak V. Amerike, Slovak, New York, N. Y.	John Vicario, Corriere della Sera, Italian, New York, N. Y.
L. F. Wazeter, Tygodnik Polski, Polish, New York, N. Y.	A. Capparucci, Opinione, Italian, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. Lucaciu, Romanul in America, Roumanian, New York, N. Y.	John Cottone, Pensiero, Italian, St. Louis, Mo.
D. B. Terzakis, Metanastis, Greek, Boston, Mass.	Frank Mancini, Risveglio, Italian, Denver, Colo.
D. B. Popovich, Balkan, Servian, Chicago, Ill.	T. Sandegren, Puget Sound Posten, Swedish, Tacoma, Wash.
John Vicario, Araldo Italiano, Italian, New York, N. Y.	John Haluska, Slovensko-Americky Zbavnik, Slovak, Chicago, Ill.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

In response to the request of the chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the following letter was received from the Treasury Department relative to the sums collected as "head tax:"

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, February 17, 1910.

HON. BENJAMIN F. HOWELL,
*Chairman Committee on Immigration and Naturalization,
House of Representatives.*

SIR: In reply to your communication of the 15th instant requesting information relative to the amount received from head tax upon aliens entering the United States since June 30, 1906, I have the honor to advise you as follows:

Year.	Head tax.
Fiscal year 1907 (July 1, 1906, to June 30, 1907).....	\$2,778,716.99
Fiscal year 1908 (July 1, 1907, to June 30, 1908).....	3,376,548.99
Fiscal year 1909 (July 1, 1908, to June 30, 1909).....	3,257,236.00
Fiscal year 1910 (6 months, July 1, 1909, to Dec. 31, 1909).....	1,730,260.00
Month of January, 1910.....	218,927.21

From other sources there was paid into the Treasury under the laws relating to immigration, as follows:

Year.	Immigration fines.	Exclusive privileges.
Fiscal year 1907.....	\$48,140.10
Fiscal year 1908.....	38,863.00	\$12,348.58
Fiscal year 1909.....	35,558.06	12,240.55
Fiscal year 1910 (6 months).....	21,041.00	7,050.71
Month of January, 1910.....	8,320.00	1,067.44

These figures represent the receipts as covered into the Treasury upon data furnished by depositors when certificates of deposit are issued. They differ slightly from the results obtained from the subsequent settlement and adjustment of the accounts by the Auditor for the State and other Departments, made upon later advices received by him exhibiting the definite source of the deposits having final audit.

Respectfully,
CHARLES D. NORTON, *Acting Secretary.*

The following letter was also received on the same subject from the Department of Commerce and Labor, with accompanying tables, giving statistics for the years 1906, 1907, 1908, and 1909:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, February 28, 1910.

MY DEAR MR. HOWELL: In accordance with the wishes of your committee, expressed to me verbally and in your letter of the 15th instant, I have to transmit the following:

(1) A statement showing the balance of the immigrant fund July 1, 1905; the sums collected from head tax, exclusive privileges, and immigration fines; the repayments to the fund from all sources; and the cost of maintaining the Immigration Service at large and the Immigration Commission during the fiscal years 1906, 1907, 1908, and 1909.

(2) A statement of the appropriations charged against the "immigrant fund" between July 1, 1905, and June 30, 1909, as provided by the acts of Congress cited in the statement; the disbursements from each of these appropriations and the balance remaining in each February 23, 1910.

(3) An analysis of the balance of the "immigrant fund" February 23, 1910.

(4) A statement showing the total number of aliens coming into the United States during the fiscal years 1906, 1907, 1908, and 1909; the number exempted from the payment of head tax admitted during these years, pursuant to law, and showing separately those admitted without the payment of head tax under rule 2 (D) of the immigration regulations; the number taxed during these years and the amount of collections for each of these years.

Attention is invited to the fact that in the statement for the years 1906 and 1907 aliens debarred are included with the aliens arriving in the United States during these years, and are not referred to in the tables for the fiscal years 1908 and 1909. This was done because during the first two years the head tax was collected on those debarred, a practice not prevailing since July 1, 1907.

(5) A copy of the opinion of the solicitor of the Department of Commerce and Labor, dated October 20, 1907, as to whether, by the terms of the immigration act of February 20, 1907, head tax should be collected on account of aliens coming to the United States from Canada, Newfoundland, Cuba, and Mexico, in cases (1) where citizens or residents of the countries named, legally domiciled therein, seek to enter the United States after July 1, 1907, and it appears that during the year immediately preceding such entrance the continuity of their physical presence at their place of domicile was broken by one or more visits to the United States, or to some other country, and (2) where citizens of the countries named, legally domiciled in the United States, having returned to the country of their citizenship after July 1, 1907, seek to reenter the United States, the place of their domicile, before the period of a full year has intervened between the date of their departure from and the date of their return to the United States.

Your attention is especially invited to the fact that this opinion has received the personal approval of Attorney-General Wickersham.

The collections on account of head tax shown in these statements, and taken from the records of the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, agree with the accounts of the customs officers and immigration officers collecting head tax, as audited by the Auditor for the State and other Departments, with the exception of \$490.48. This difference is partly due to the collection of \$265.66 from the official receiver and liquidator of the Canadian Lines (Limited), on account of \$376 due the United States as head tax at the time of the failure of the Canadian Lines (Limited), and small adjustments found to be necessary in the audit of the accounts.

Under the system of accounting, officers receiving public moneys from individuals, corporations, or from other sources must account for such receipts in the month in which they were received and receipted for. The public depositaries issue "certificates of deposit" to public officers for public moneys on the day that such moneys are actually received by the depositaries. The date of the certificate of deposit is the record of receipt of the money in the Treasury, and the record on which the "warrant" directing the placing of the money on the ledgers of the Treasury is issued and the date of issue of the "warrant" determines the fiscal year to be charged with the receipts.

Under this practice moneys are accounted for by receiving officers and audited as of one year and actually received in another year, when the accounting is in the

last month of one fiscal year and "warrants" issued in the first month of the succeeding fiscal year.

As moneys formally paid into the Treasury of the United States can not be withdrawn without a specific appropriation for their withdrawal, as provided by Article I, section 9, clause 7, of the Constitution of the United States, it is necessary in connection with the collection of head tax to have collectors of customs and immigration officers receiving such tax to open special deposit accounts with the government depositaries for the receipt of money to be held until the question of the right of the Government thereto is determined. Moneys placed in special deposit accounts are subject to the checks of the receiving officer making the deposits, as such funds have not been acknowledged by the depositary with a certificate of deposit.

A special deposit account is essential in the immigrant head-tax collections in cases of aliens in transit and pending before boards of special inquiry as to admission, because if the transient aliens leave the country within sixty days the head tax must be refunded, and if deported the collections must be refunded.

In many cases application is never made for a refund of head tax, and the money is frequently deposited in the Treasury of the United States in a year subsequent to that in which it was actually received by the collectors of customs or immigration officers.

The explanations account for a net difference of \$22,870.91 between the audited accounts for the four years hereinbefore referred to and the "covering-in warrants" based on "certificates of deposit" issued and dated within the period.

The differences between the amount due, as shown by audited accounts and by "covering-in warrants" issued on "certificates of deposit," will continue until the account of head tax is finally audited and closed by discontinuance of the account.

Respectfully,

BENJ. S. CABLE, *Acting Secretary.*

HON. BENJAMIN F. HOWELL,

*Chairman Committee on Immigration and Naturalization,
House of Representatives.*

The tables prepared by Mr. William L. Soleau, disbursing clerk, Department of Commerce and Labor, follow:

Statement showing the balance of the immigrant fund July 1, 1905; the sums collected from head tax, exclusive privileges, and immigration fines; the repayments to the fund from all sources; and the cost of maintaining the Immigration Service at large and the Immigration Commission during the fiscal years 1906, 1907, 1908, and 1909.

	1906.	1907.	1908.	1909.	Total.
RECEIPTS.					
Balance, immigrant fund, July 1, 1905.....					\$1,638,734.58
Collections on account of head tax	\$2,294,094.93	\$2,778,716.99	\$3,376,548.99	\$3,257,236.00	11,706,596.91
On account of exclusive privileges			12,345.58	12,240.55	24,586.13
On account of immigration fines.	30,737.79	48,140.10	38,863.00	35,558.06	153,298.95
REPAYMENTS TO FUND.					
On account of one-half cost of inland transportation of aliens to be deported.....	367.14	590.68	1,945.30	2,833.87	5,736.99
On account of care and detention of aliens.....	93,206.37	177,751.85	228,675.36	104,097.27	603,730.85
On account of ice, laundry, and telephone service.....	1,449.30	2,466.01	2,525.70	2,332.85	8,773.86
On account of balance of appropriation "Steel twin-screw ferryboat," Ellis Island, N. Y....		5,506.24			5,506.24
On account of balance of appropriation, "Repairs, etc., property at Ellis Island, N. Y.".....		41,179.40			41,179.40
Total.....					14,188,143.91

Statement showing the balance the immigrant fund July 1, 1905; the sums collected from head tax, etc.—Continued.

	1906.	1907.	1908.	1909.	Total.
EXPENDITURES.					
Since July 1, 1909, on account of liabilities incurred in prior years.....					\$237,956.66
Salaries and expenses in enforcing the immigration laws, exclusive of the Chinese-exclusion laws, and salaries of bureau at seat of government.....	01,602,796.76	\$1,805,544.73	\$2,194,855.61	\$2,036,840.13	7,640,037.23
Warrants in favor of the Immigration Commission, authorized by act of Feb. 20, 1907 (34 Stats., 909).....					524,175.78
Total.....					8,402,169.67
Balance of receipts, for disposition of which see accompanying analysis.....					^a 5,785,974.24

^a The salaries of officers and employees in the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization at the seat of government were specially appropriated for from the immigrant fund and are included in the accompanying statement of appropriations charged against the fund. For the four years these appropriations amounted to \$220,040. This sum should be deducted from the above balance when this statement is separately considered, leaving the balance of the immigrant fund, \$5,565,934.24.

Appropriations charged against the immigrant fund between July 1, 1905, and June 30, 1909, as provided by acts of Congress cited.

	Appropriations.	Disbursements.	Balance.
Immigrant station, Ellis Island, N. Y.....	\$1,518,000.00	\$1,424,776.21	\$93,223.79
Sundry civil act, Mar. 3, 1905.			
Urgent deficiency act, Dec. 19, 1906.			
Sundry civil act, Mar. 4, 1907.			
Deficiency act, Feb. 15, 1908.			
Deficiency act, May 30, 1908.			
Sundry civil act, May 27, 1908.			
Immigrant station, San Francisco, Cal.....	200,000.00	200,000.00
Sundry civil act, Mar. 3, 1905.			
Sundry civil act, June 30, 1906.			
Immigrant station, Charleston, S. C.....	70,000.00	70,000.00
Public act, Mar. 4, 1907.			
Immigrant station, Galveston, Tex.....	70,000.00	10,801.63	59,198.37
Public act, Mar. 4, 1907.			
Immigrant station, New Orleans, La.....	70,000.00	70,000.00
Public act, Mar. 4, 1907.			
Immigrant station, Philadelphia, Pa.....	250,000.00	250,000.00
Public act, Feb. 6, 1908.			
Ferry steamer, Immigration Service, San Francisco, Cal.....	115,000.00	13.91	114,986.09
Sundry civil act, May 27, 1908.			
Boarding cutter, Immigration Service, San Francisco, Cal.....	25,000.00	22,000.00	3,000.00
Sundry civil act, May 27, 1908.			
Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service.....	460,000.00	460,000.00
Sundry civil act, June 30, 1906.			
Sundry civil act, Mar. 4, 1907.			
Deficiency act, Feb. 15, 1908.			
Sundry civil act, May 27, 1908.			
Pay, assistant attorneys in naturalization cases.....	150,000.00	150,000.00
Sundry civil act, May 27, 1908.			
Enforcing Chinese exclusion laws.....	1,500,000.00	1,300,683.64	199,316.36
Sundry civil act, June 30, 1906.			
Sundry civil act, Mar. 4, 1907.			
Sundry civil act, May 27, 1908.			
Salaries, Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization.....	220,040.00	180,526.80	39,513.20
Legislative act, Feb. 3, 1905.			
Legislative act, June 22, 1906.			
Legislative act, Feb. 26, 1907.			
Legislative act, May 22, 1908.			
Total.....	4,648,040.00	3,748,802.19	899,237.81

Analysis of balance of immigrant fund shown in accompanying statement.

Balance of immigrant fund after deducting operating expenses to June 30, 1909.....	\$5,785,974.24
Deficiency appropriation act of March 4, 1909.....	600,000.00
Total available to settle liabilities incurred and chargeable prior to June 30, 1909.....	6,385,974.24
Deducted from the immigrant fund by operation of law:	
As per statement of special appropriations herewith.....	\$4,648,040.00
To miscellaneous receipts—	
Fiscal year 1908 (head-tax collections in excess of \$2,500,000).....	927,760.57
Fiscal year 1909 (head-tax collections in excess of \$2,500,000).....	805,034.61
	6,380,835.18
Balance.....	5,139.06
Balance of permanent indefinite appropriation February 23, 1910.....	1,062.29
Amount received by customs officers during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1905, and included in their accounts for that fiscal year for which certificates of deposit were not issued prior to July 1, 1905, by depositaries.....	a 4,076.86

NOTE.—The approved vouchers now on file in the Secretary's office for payment from the appropriation 'Expenses of regulating immigration' (immigrant fund) aggregate \$24,640.44.

An estimate of appropriation in the urgent deficiency estimates is now pending in Congress.

Statement showing the number of aliens admitted to the United States during the fiscal years 1906, 1907, 1908, and 1909, the number exempt from payment of head tax, the number paying head tax, and the amount of head tax collected, as shown by the records of the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization.

	1906.	1907.
Immigrant aliens admitted.....	1,100,735	1,285,349
Nonimmigrant aliens admitted.....	65,618	153,120
Aliens debarred.....	12,432	13,064
Deserting alien seamen.....	9,636	9,495
Pending from previous year.....	21,741	28,215
	1,210,162	1,489,243
Aliens exempt from payment of head tax:		
In transit.....	31,705	41,070
Citizens of Cuba.....	6,963	8,480
Citizens of British North America and Mexico from countries other than British North America and Mexico.....	2,690	2,425
	41,358	51,975
Cases pending settlement at close of fiscal year.....	28,215	52,566
	69,573	104,541
Number of aliens taxed at \$2 per head.....	1,140,589	1,384,702
Head tax collected during the year.....	\$2,281,178	\$2,769,404
	1908.	1909.
Immigrant aliens admitted.....	782,870	751,786
Nonimmigrant aliens admitted.....	141,825	192,449
Deserting alien seamen.....	6,802	3,181
Aliens from Porto Rico and Hawaii.....	480	562
Pending from previous year.....	52,566	21,705
	984,543	969,683
Aliens exempt from payment of head tax:		
In transit.....	38,345	33,465
One-year residents of Cuba.....	4,480	7,098
One-year residents of British North America and Mexico.....	32,213	62,801
Rule 2 (d) Immigration Regulations.....	3,255	6,877
Government officials.....	108	338
Arrivals in Hawaii.....	10,851	2,407
Arrivals in Porto Rico.....	2,629	2,546
	91,881	115,532
Cases pending settlement at close of fiscal year.....	21,705	40,539
	113,586	156,071
Number of aliens taxed at \$2 per head.....	52,566	
Number of aliens taxed at \$4 per head.....	818,391	
	870,957	813,612
Head tax collected during the year.....	\$3,378,696	\$3,254,448

a In such cases the "Covering in warrants" are credited to the fiscal years in which the certificates of deposits are issued and the receiving officers include such receipts in their accounts for the fiscal years in which the moneys are received.

Statement showing the number of aliens admitted to the United States during the fiscal years 1906, 1907, 1908, and 1909, etc.—Continued.

RECAPITULATION.

	Head tax collected.	Number taxed.	Number exempt.	Number unsettled close of fiscal year.	Total.
1906.....	\$2,281,178.00	1,140,589	41,358	28,215	1,210,162
1907.....	2,769,404.00	1,384,702	51,975	52,566	1,489,243
1908.....	3,378,696.00	870,957	91,881	21,705	984,543
1909.....	3,254,448.00	813,612	115,532	40,539	969,683
Total.....	11,683,726.00	4,209,860	300,746	143,025	4,653,631

There was also submitted from the Department of Commerce and Labor the following letter from Mr. Charles Earl, the solicitor for the department, which was approved by Hon. George W. Wickersham, the Attorney-General:

OCTOBER 30, 1907.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.,

SIR: My opinion is requested as to whether, by the terms of the immigration act of February 20, 1907, head tax should be collected on account of aliens coming to the United States from Canada, Newfoundland, Cuba, and Mexico, under the following circumstances:

1. Where citizens or residents of the countries named, legally domiciled therein, seek to enter the United States after July 1, 1907, and where it appears that, during the year immediately preceding such entrance, the continuity of their physical presence at their place of domicile was broken by one or more visits to the United States or to some other country.

2. Where citizens of the countries named, legally domiciled in the United States, having returned to the country of their citizenship after July 1, 1907, seek to reenter the United States, the place of their domicile, before the period of a full year has intervened between the date of their departure from and the date of their return to the United States.

Before considering the text of the present statute it is important to refer to the previous law on the subject, for the prior law is, in the words of Coke, "the very lock and key to set open the windows of the statute." (2 Inst., 308.) The immigration act of March 3, 1903, provided for the collection of a head tax on account of "every passenger not a citizen of the United States, or of the Dominion of Canada, the Republic of Cuba, or of the Republic of Mexico, who shall come" to the United States. Newfoundland was added to this list by the act of March 22, 1904. Until this law was superseded by the present act, therefore, head tax was never collected from a citizen of any of the countries specified. In repealing and reenacting the prior law with reference to the collection of head tax the present act provided for the payment of the tax "for every alien entering the United States," and, further, "that the said tax shall not be levied upon aliens who shall enter the United States after an uninterrupted residence of at least one year immediately preceding such entrance in the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland, the Republic of Cuba, or the Republic of Mexico."

The committee of the House, in reporting the measure containing the phraseology last quoted, said, in explanation of the changes made:

"Referring to the last proviso of this section, after consultation with the State Department, it was thought advisable by your committee to make domicile rather than citizenship the test for exemption from the head tax."

The purpose of Congress, therefore, in altering the terms of the exemption in the manner noted, was to provide that whereas, theretofore persons who were citizens of neighboring countries were exempt from head tax, thereafter not only citizens of those countries, but also persons domiciled therein, should be exempt from this exaction. The object, then, was not to narrow the exemption, but to enlarge it. Citizens had all along been exempt; it was now proposed to make not only citizens, but bona fide residents likewise exempt. Lest, however, a colorable or merely pretended residence should be availed of by persons other than citizens of the countries named, for the

purpose of evading the tax, it was provided that they should be exempt only "after an uninterrupted residence of at least one year."

It will be recalled that the House committee stated that the terms of the exemption were altered "after consultation with the State Department." The Secretary of State, of whom inquiry was made, has advised the Secretary of this department that he was personally present in conference with the House Committee on Immigration when they considered this subject; that the intention of Congress in making the change was "to enlarge the exemption from payment of head tax, in order to facilitate free intercommunication between the United States and our immediate neighbors;" that "there was no room for question that the purpose of making the change was to make it possible for people who were domiciled in Canada, Mexico, etc., although not citizens of those countries, to pass to and fro over the border;" and that, in his opinion, "the construction of the new statute should be that the residence mentioned in section 1 of the act of February 20, 1907, is legal residence or domicile, and not actual physical presence, just as you and I both have our legal residence or domicile in the State of New York, notwithstanding our physical presence in Washington;" and he adds, "this construction, I think, is in accordance with the intent of the act."

The phrase "uninterrupted residence," accordingly, becomes the equivalent of residence or domicile uninterrupted by the acquisition of a legal domicile elsewhere. And since a legal domicile is not lost, nor a new one acquired, by occasional visits abroad, or temporary sojourns in other places, a person who can show a bona fide residence or domicile of a year or more in one of the countries specified, uninterrupted otherwise than by occasional and temporary absences of the character mentioned, is entitled to the benefit of the exemption. That this interpretation fully accords with the intention of Congress can scarcely be questioned. "A thing may be within the letter of a statute and not within its meaning, and within its meaning though not within its letter" (23 Wall., 374, 380). The letter of the present statute prescribes an "uninterrupted residence of at least one year," and is, therefore, capable of being interpreted to require an uninterrupted period of physical presence in one place of abode, but the meaning of the statute, as stated by those who framed it, and as vouched for by the head of the department who advised it, if it is to have the beneficial effect intended, requires that it be given the interpretation above suggested. "Residence" and "domicile" may often properly be distinguished (*Brisenden v. Chamberlain*, 53 Fed., 307, 311), but are frequently regarded as synonymous, and are generally so regarded with respect to the subject of voting, eligibility to office, taxation, jurisdiction in divorce, and probate administration (*People v. Platt*, 3 N. Y., Supp., 367, 369). They were evidently regarded as synonymous by the framers of the present act, for one word was used in the report of the committee and the other in the law.

The phrase "uninterrupted residence" may therefore be held to mean "uninterrupted domicile or residence." And the word "uninterrupted," in its turn, may with equal propriety be taken to preclude an interruption of domicile or residence of the kind intended by the act. Thus in construing a telephone contract which provided for a service not interrupted otherwise than by the negligence of the subscriber it was held that an interruption of service within the meaning of the contract was "an interruption of the kind of service contracted for." (*Telephone Co. v. Porter*, 43 S. E., 441, 442.) The kind of domicile or residence intended by the present act is, as has been shown, a legal domicile or a bona fide residence, and, clearly, a domicile or residence of this character is not "interrupted" by occasional, temporary, and transient absences from the usual place of abode. (*Daubman v. Camden*, 39 N. J. Law, 57, 59.)

It is therefore concluded that head tax should not be collected on account of aliens entering the United States after July 1, 1907, from Canada, Newfoundland, Cuba, or Mexico, whose legal domicile or bona fide residence was in one of the countries specified for at least one year immediately preceding such entrance, if it merely appears that the continuity of their physical presence at their place of residence or domicile was broken by one or more transient and temporary departures therefrom.

2. "The preexisting law and the reasons and purpose of the new enactment," says the Supreme Court, "are considerations of great weight." (23 Wall., 374, 380.) By the previous law citizens of neighboring countries were exempt from payment of head tax. It is true that the previous law has been repealed, but it is still proper to resort to it as affording a legislative exposition of the features of it which are retained. (3 Wall., 495, 513; 109 U. S., 556, 561.) There is nothing, then, in the new enactment which discloses any intention to exact the head tax from persons who were then exempt; on the other hand, the very difference between the old enactment and the new manifests an intention to continue the exemption in favor of those already relieved and to extend it so as to cover others besides. By making "domicile rather than citizenship the test for exemption," no other purpose could have been entertained.

Domicile as a qualification comprehends a larger class of persons than citizenship; in general, and as ordinarily applied, it includes the class comprehended by citizenship, and includes also a class in addition. It is only in the few scattered and exceptional cases where domicile and citizenship do not coincide that the former qualification does not imply the latter. It may safely be presumed that the occurrence of instances of this exceptional character was not foreseen, else they would have been expressly provided for. "In the nature of things statutes can not be so framed as, by express exemption, to provide for every possible unforeseen, and even foreseen, case thereafter to arise, which, while within the terms of their main provisions, is still outside of their spirit and purpose. And what can not be done the courts should understand as not having been attempted." (Bishop, Written Laws, 236.)

In the practical execution of the law, therefore, shall it be said that these anomalous and exceptional cases were not intended to be covered by the broad terms of an exemption which, apart from peculiar circumstances, would clearly embrace them? A citizen of Canada, for example, whose permanent residence and domicile is in the United States, journeys to Canada, where he remains for less than a year, and then returns to the United States; does the act require the collection of head tax in his case? It is to be noted that when this person first entered the United States he was relieved of payment of head tax by the express provision of the law then in force, and, further, that had the present law been in force at that time he would still have been exempt from such payment, and, yet further, that were he now entering the United States for the first time he would still again be exempt from the requirement in question, and, further still, were he to extend his visit beyond a year he would be again exempt. What, then, is the change that has taken place in his status? Only that he has acquired a residence and domicile in the United States. What is there in the reason for the present enactment which would exclude such persons from the benefit of the exemption? The imposition of the head tax is not a revenue measure, but a regulation of immigration and is designed to create a fund to defray the expenses of administering the immigration laws (112 U. S., 580); and the purpose of the present exemption is to facilitate social and commercial intercommunication between this and neighboring countries by relieving citizens or residents of such countries passing to and fro between their own country and this of the burden of paying a tax upon immigrants. This motive is as potent in the case of a citizen of a neighboring country domiciled in the United States as it is in the case of such a citizen domiciled in his own country. If domicile in his own country is a good ground for the exemption of such a citizen, domicile in the United States is so in no slighter degree.

It can not be supposed that Congress intended to penalize visits of a citizen and former resident of Canada to his own country while encouraging visits of Canadian residents to this country. This would be putting a premium on residence in Canada, and at the same time discriminating against residence in the United States.

This much, in any event, would seem to be clear, namely, where a person is admitted to the United States for the first time, after a showing of the required previous residence of one year in one of the countries specified, and where, therefore, the exemption has once attached, the benefit of the exemption is a continuing one, and he may afterwards go back and forth without being subject to the tax; and scarcely less clear, it is believed, is the case of a citizen of one of the countries specified, who has acquired a residence or domicile in the United States prior to the passage of the present act, and who subsequently goes to his own country for a visit, and returns to the United States within a year. Since he has become one of the population of the United States, it may be doubted whether he needs any exemption—whether, in other words, the head-tax provision applies to him at all. But if it does apply to him, then it is thought that he may, for the reasons given, be brought either within the operation of the exemption stated or within the operation of a further exemption contained in the same section of the statute. The section provides, not merely that the tax shall not be levied upon aliens "who shall enter the United States after an uninterrupted residence of at least one year immediately preceding such entrance," in neighboring countries, but that it shall not be levied "upon otherwise admissible residents of any possession of the United States." So to construe the latter clause is merely to give to residence or domicile in the United States, in the case of citizens of the countries specified, the benefit of the same advantages which the law accords to residence or domicile in neighboring countries. Ordinarily, of course, the exemption embodied in the clause last quoted implies that head tax was paid on account of such aliens at the time of their original admission to a possession of the United States, and hence the provision of rule 2, section (d) of the Immigration Regulations; but the exemption contained in the previous clause expressly relieves residents of the countries in question of the obligation of such payment. In the case of residents of these countries, therefore, the implication of previous payment does not arise, nor does the rule apply.

It is accordingly further concluded that head tax should not be collected on account of aliens reentering the United States after July 1, 1907, from Canada, Newfoundland, Cuba, or Mexico, who are citizens thereof, but who have acquired a legal domicile or bona fide residence in the United States, and who are returning from a visit to one of the said countries, notwithstanding that the period of a full year has not intervened between the date of their departure from and the date of their return to the United States.

Respectfully submitted.

CHARLES EARL, *Solicitor*.

Approved:

GEO. W. WICKERSHAM, *Attorney-General*.

HEARING ON NATURALIZATION BILLS.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Tuesday, March 1, 1910.

The committee this day met, Hon. Benjamin F. Howell, chairman, presiding.

Others present were Representatives Elvins, Goldfogle, Edwards, Bennet, of New York, Hayes, Küstermann, and Sabath.

The CHAIRMAN. We will hear Mr. Campbell.

STATEMENT OF MR. RICHARD K. CAMPBELL, CHIEF BUREAU OF NATURALIZATION, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I have been a little tardy in attending to this request and in reporting on this bill. Of course, I desire to call your attention to the fact that I was acting in purely a ministerial way and it is not the department's bill.

As I understood the request it was that I should prepare provisional legislation to cover certain points discussed here in the committee as to which the committee seemed to be agreed. I have done that, and in discussing the matter with the Assistant Secretary of the department he felt, in view of all the circumstances, particularly some public criticisms recently of administrative officers preparing legislation and urging it upon Congress, that I should bring to the attention of the committee that it was not something which the department urged or asked for, but something that was submitted at the request of the committee.

It seems to me, gentlemen, the best plan I can adopt will be to read this bill slowly, and you can then stop me at any point. The bill is prepared in such a way that the proposed new legislation can readily be distinguished from the existing law, because the existing law, so far as embodied in the proposed act, is underscored.

Mr. BENNET. Just a minute. I do not think there is any human possibility that we can consider and report that bill this morning, and I would like to make a suggestion, that the bill be printed for the use of the committee and that we have a meeting on Friday for naturalization purposes, and in that way we can give an hour and a half to Mr. Campbell.

Mr. ELVINS. Mr. Campbell is here now.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not think it will take more than fifteen or twenty minutes for me to explain this bill, because there is very little added.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I think we better go ahead with Mr. Campbell now.

Mr. BENNET. Then I withdraw the request.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The first section is a reenactment of section 2166 of the Revised Statutes, relating to those who have enlisted or may enlist in the armies of the United States:

That any alien of the age of twenty-one years and upward who has enlisted, or may hereafter enlist, in the armies of the United States, either the regular or the volunteer forces, or in the United States Navy or Marine Corps, and has been, or may be hereafter, honorably discharged therefrom—

That is a provision of the present law—

may, at the expiration of one term of enlistment therein, if still a member of the service from which he obtained such honorable discharge, or if he has been a member of such service within six months prior to the date on which he may file his petition under the provisions of this act—

That six months is in deference to what Mr. Sabath said, as you remember, Mr. Hayes. He maintained that they should probably have an indefinite length of time to be allowed to apply, under this provision that would exempt them from the general provisions of the law, and, I think, you suggested six months or some such term. At all events that is embodied here for your consideration—

without any previous declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States—

The CHAIRMAN. Does that provide that a man must have served at least three years?

Mr. CAMPBELL. You are thinking about the provision in regard to seamen.

Mr. HAYES. We wanted to embody the same rule for all branches of the service, including the merchant marine.

Mr. CAMPBELL. You will see why I treat them separately as I go on. Of course, the committee can make such changes as they think desirable.

petition for naturalization in any court authorized to grant citizenship; and the honorable discharge certificate of such alien from the service of the United States, and the affidavits of two credible witnesses, citizens of the United States, identifying the applicant as the honorably discharged person named in the discharge certificate presented, shall be deemed competent and sufficient proof of the residence and good moral character required by law, and either the original or a certified copy of such discharge shall be attached to and made a part of the petition, and he shall not be required to prove one year's residence within the State in which he files his application to become a citizen, and the petition of any such alien shall be docketed, and final hearing had thereon by the court, immediately or at the convenience of the court.

Mr. ELVINS. Suppose there is a soldier who has served in the civil war, for example—

Mr. CAMPBELL. We have not yet reached that section.

Mr. ELVINS. He would not have to live a year within the State?

Mr. CAMPBELL. That question comes under another section. That is practically the construction the courts have already put on the law. This refers to men who are in the military service or who have left within six months. We will get to the other class later.

SEC. 2. Every seaman, being a foreigner, of the age of twenty-one years and upward, who declares his intention of becoming a citizen of the United States in any court of competent jurisdiction, and shall have served three years subsequent to the date of such declaration on board of a merchant vessel of the United States, may, if still serving on any such vessel, petition for naturalization in any court authorized to grant citizenship; and the production of a certificate of such service and good conduct during that time from the master of the said vessel, together with the certificate of his declaration to become a citizen of the United States, which shall be at-

tached to and made a part of his petition, and the affidavits of two credible witnesses, citizens of the United States, identifying him as the person named in the certificate of service, and the declaration presented, shall be deemed competent and sufficient proof of the residence and good moral character required by law; and he shall not be required to prove one year's residence within the State in which he files his application to become a citizen; and the petition of such seaman shall be docketed, and final hearing had thereon by the court immediately, or at the convenience of the court—

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Please read that last sentence again?

Mr. CAMPBELL (reading):

And the petition of such seaman shall be docketed, and final hearing had thereon by the court, immediately, or at the convenience of the court.

Of course the only object of delay under the general law is to give the administrative officers a chance to investigate the moral character or the claims, in any respect, of a petitioner. Here, it is not needed.

And every seaman, being a foreigner, shall, after his declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States, and after he shall have served such three years, be deemed a citizen of the United States for the purpose of manning and serving on board any merchant vessel of the United States, anything to the contrary in any act of Congress notwithstanding, but such seaman shall, for all purposes of protection as an American citizen, be deemed such, after the filing of his declaration of intention to become such citizen.

I want to say in reference to the last section that Mr. Chamberlain, the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, saw this bill while it was in the Secretary's office and became rather exercised over the power given to a captain to furnish an honorable discharge or to furnish a certificate of service and good behavior. I told him the reason for doing that was that the captain alone was cognizant of the facts. He said he wanted it extended to discharges or certificates issued by the shipping commissioners of the United States and by collectors of customs. I told him that I would report that to the committee.

Mr. HAYES. Who was that?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chamberlain, the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation. I asked him to write me his views, so that there could be no mistake, and he modifies them in this letter which I have brought for the information of the committee. He still seems to think that it might be a good point, as the captains are sometimes reversed upon charges of misconduct by the shipping commissioners. Of course, I refer it to the committee to do whatever it chooses.

Mr. BENNET. The captain is never reversed on a statement that a man has a good character?

Mr. CAMPBELL. No; I think not.

(The letter from Mr. E. T. Chamberlain, Chief Bureau of Navigation, referred to by Mr. Campbell, follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
BUREAU OF NAVIGATION,
Washington, February 28, 1910.

Mr. RICHARD K. CAMPBELL,
Chief Division of Naturalization,
Department of Commerce and Labor, Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. CAMPBELL: Referring to section 3 of the draft of the bill prepared by you relating to naturalization, I beg to call your attention to the provision which requires that the certificate of service and good conduct issued by the master shall be necessary to enable a seaman to avail himself of the provisions of section 2174 of the Revised Statutes in applying for naturalization. Objection may be raised to this on the ground that it gives the master an exceptional power over the seaman.

When I telephoned you this morning I thought the situation might be met by pro-

viding as an alternative that the shipping commissioner also before whom the seaman is discharged may be empowered to issue a certificate of service and good conduct. Shipping commissioners have the power under Revised Statutes 4554, 4555 to arbitrate disputes between masters and seamen which sometimes involves fines for alleged misconduct, and sometimes, of course, the commissioner decides in favor of the seaman and against the master. In such a case the shipping commissioner's ruling in favor of the seaman ought to count for more than the master's allegation of misconduct.

Sections 4549 and 4551 of the Revised Statutes govern discharges and I inclose a copy of the form. Your section 3 states the present law, but it is a question whether under the new and more rigid naturalization law the alternative I suggest should not be provided.

Respectfully,

E. T. CHAMBERLAIN,
Commissioner.

MR. CAMPBELL. That covers those two sections. Now, here is a section that I referred to generally when I was here, and it also covers certain branches of the military service, the auxiliary naval service, the Revenue-Cutter Service, and a number of others whose employees are necessarily in the line of their duty prevented from complying with the general provisions of the law. I think it was my suggestion that they be embodied in specific legislation to show just what they should do. I submit this for your consideration.

SEC. 3. That any alien of the age of twenty-one years and upward, who declares his intention of becoming a citizen of the United States in any court of competent jurisdiction, and shall have served five years subsequent to the date of such declaration on board of any vessel employed in the service of the United States, either civil, military, or naval, may, if still engaged in such service, petition for naturalization in any court authorized to grant citizenship; and the production of a certificate of such service, and of good conduct during that time, from the head of the department under which said alien is serving, together with the certificate of his declaration to become a citizen of the United States, which shall be attached to and made a part of his petition, and the affidavits of two credible witnesses, citizens of the United States, identifying him as the person named in the certificate of service, and the declaration presented, shall be deemed competent and sufficient proof of the residence and good moral character required by law; and he shall not be required to prove one year's residence within the State in which he files his application to become a citizen; and the petition of such alien shall be docketed and final hearing had thereon by the court, immediately, or at the convenience of the court.

Now, the general language of those three sections as to what is required might fortify the suggestion of Judge Hayes that one section be used, but I have treated them separately, because I reembodyed in the act the provisions with regard to seamen contained in section 2174 of the Revised Statutes and of section 2166 of the Revised Statutes.

The next section is one that was intended to cover all classes referred to in the bills H. R. 14574 and 14575.

MR. ELVINS. The Howland bills?

MR. CAMPBELL. Yes, sir; that is the one to which you referred a few moments ago. It provides as follows:

SEC. 4. Any alien who has performed service in the army or navy of the United States prior to the year eighteen hundred and seventy, or a child of any such alien, after reaching the age of twenty-one years, may, upon satisfactory proof to the court in which he shall apply therefor of the performance of the service claimed, and of honorable discharge therefrom, be entitled, upon compliance with the other provisions of the act of June twenty-ninth, nineteen hundred and six, chapter thirty-five hundred and ninety-two, Statutes at Large of the United States, nineteen hundred and five to nineteen hundred and seven, to be naturalized without making any declaration of intention.

THE CHAIRMAN. Please read that again.

MR. CAMPBELL. Certainly.

Any alien who has performed service in the army or navy of the United States prior to the year eighteen hundred and seventy, or a child of any such alien, after reaching the age of twenty-one years, may, upon satisfactory proof to the court in which he shall apply therefor of the performance of the service claimed, and of honorable discharge therefrom, be entitled, upon compliance with the other provisions of the act of June twenty-ninth, nineteen hundred and six, chapter thirty-five hundred and ninety-two, Statutes at Large of the United States, nineteen hundred and five to nineteen hundred and seven, to be naturalized without making any declaration of intention.

There is no exemption there from the one year's jurisdictional requirement. There is no provision there that he shall be heard in less than ninety days after the filing of his petition. I did not know whether it was the pleasure of the committee to assume good moral conduct or good character on the part of those people or whether they preferred that the Government should make a similar investigation for the purpose of establishing that fact.

Mr. BENNET. I think that is all right.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. You do not refer to the child again.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, sir; that is true. I noticed that this morning in going over it again, but I think almost any court would construe it so as to cover that point.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Well, it ought to be put in there.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes; I think it should, and upon proof of relationship, if it be a child of some person who has performed that service.

I have a section here, section 5, which repeals sections 2166 and 2174, and the provision of the act of July 26, 1894, in regard to seamen, because what is vital in those provisions is embodied in this act.

SEC. 6. That all provisions of the act of June twenty-ninth, nineteen hundred and six, chapter thirty-five hundred and ninety-two, Statutes at Large of the United States, nineteen hundred and five to nineteen hundred and seven—

This is rather precautionary.

shall apply to petitions for naturalization filed under this act, in so far as exception has not been specifically made herein to such provisions.

That, perhaps, is somewhat unnecessary, but it is very satisfying to some of the courts. It removes any doubt.

Mr. HAYES. They do not have to consider any inferences?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Not any inferences at all; there is the plain provision of the law.

Section 7 is one that I have some doubt about and I apologize for embodying it, as you gentlemen did not ask me to put it in, but I have put it in and the committee can do what it pleases.

SEC. 7. That nothing in this, or any other act, shall be construed as repealing or in any way limiting section twenty-one hundred and sixty-nine of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

That is the provision, Mr. Hayes, to which you referred.

I would like to explain my insertion of a limitation in one portion of the bill. You recollect when I was last before the committee we were discussing this question of exempting people who served in the army, either the regular or volunteer forces, and there was some difference of opinion as to whether the exemptions should be confined to persons who at the time of filing a petition were still members of the service. I thought not. I think there was some discussion back and forth and finally somebody, I think it was Mr. Hayes, but I will not be positive, said something about confining it to those who had only been out a moderate time, six months or something like that,

and so I have limited the provision here to any person who has been a member within six months prior to the date on which he shall file his petition and to those who are actually in the service.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. With respect to those, what provision have you made as to proof of good moral character?

Mr. CAMPBELL. A certificate of discharge. Here is the provision in regard to that:

And the honorable discharge certificate of such alien from the service of the United States, and the affidavits of two credible witnesses, citizens of the United States, identifying the applicant as the honorably discharged person named in the discharge certificate presented, shall be deemed competent and sufficient proof of the residence and good moral character required by law.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Do you mean without regard to the time of the discharge?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Within six months. He must either still be in the service——

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Or make his application within six months?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Or make his application within six months after severing his connection with the service.

Mr. HAYES. It seems to me that is a little long.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Maybe it is. I put it in because I thought you or Mr. Sabath or somebody suggested six months.

Mr. SABATH. I thought it should be a year, because frequently men are discharged from the army, and the aim is to reach their homes, and sometimes things transpire which will make it absolutely impossible for them to devote two or three days to secure citizenship. They are obliged to look for employment, or there are other reasons, and they are unable to make the application within due time. The mere fact that they have served for three years and have been honorably discharged, I think, should entitle them to their naturalization papers.

Mr. ELVINS. Not if they put it off too long.

Mr. SABATH. I think it should be a year. I will tell you that a man frequently goes home, and before he reaches his destination it takes perhaps three or four weeks; we do not know. Sometimes, if he is discharged in the islands, it will take him six weeks, will it not?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SABATH. It may take him two months before he reaches his destination.

Mr. HAYES. Not six weeks, if he comes straight home.

Mr. SABATH. You know.

Mr. CAMPBELL. An accident at sea might delay his return.

Mr. HAYES. As a matter of fact, they are never discharged in the islands.

Mr. SABATH. They are not?

Mr. HAYES. They are always brought here and discharged, unless for disability. They might be discharged for disability in the islands.

Mr. SABATH. I admit that I am not very well informed as to the military laws.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I think six months is all right.

Mr. CAMPBELL. There is one other matter which I would like to bring to your attention. Among the bills sent to me was one not mentioned when I was here, and I paid no attention to it when drafting that measure. It is an amendment of section 2172 of the Revised

Statutes, which provides, if you recollect, that the minor children of a naturalized alien, if resident in the United States, shall become citizens of the United States by virtue of the naturalization of the parent. There is this provision added:

Any infant——

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. What are you reading from?

Mr. CAMPBELL. The bill H. R. 14576, introduced by Mr. Howland

Any infant coming to the United States under fifteen years of age and who has thereafter resided in the United States for a period of twenty-one years shall be admitted to become a citizen of the United States upon his petition and in accordance with the procedure in such cases made and provided, without any previous declaration of his intention, upon proof of such residence, good moral character, and upon further showing that he does not belong to any nationality or race not entitled to become citizens of the United States; but no person heretofore proscribed by any State shall be admitted to become a citizen without the consent of the legislature of the State in which such person was proscribed.

I did not embody that in the proposed bill because it was not mentioned here. I just left it as I found it.

Mr. ELVINS. The idea was to embody all the suggestions.

Mr. HAYES. No; to embody only the necessary provisions to correct anything in the past, but not to project anything in the future.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is the way I understood it. With regard to this class who served on vessels of the United States, I think that was the only other case.

Mr. HAYES. As far as the Howland bill was concerned, I think it was unanimously understood that we would not project any of those things into the future.

Mr. CAMPBELL. There are here the two bills suggested, I think, by Colonel Lauchheimer. I think they are provided for in that general section No. 3, which makes provision for persons serving on a vessel of the United States, either civil, military, or naval. You will recollect the section that I read a while ago. I think that covers both of those bills. If you have not copies, I will leave these with you so that you can compare them and see if it does not accomplish that purpose.

(The copies referred to are as follows:)

A BILL To provide for the naturalization of aliens who have served or shall hereafter serve for one enlistment of four years in the United States Navy or Marine Corps, or for four years in the naval auxiliary.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any alien of the age of twenty-one years and upward who has served or may hereafter serve for one enlistment of four years in the United States Navy or Marine Corps, and received an honorable discharge, or an ordinary discharge with recommendation for reenlistment, or who has completed four years of honorable service in the naval auxiliary service, shall be admitted to become a citizen of the United States upon his petition without any previous declaration of his intention to become such, and without proof of residence on shore, and the court admitting such alien shall, in addition to proof of good moral character, be satisfied by competent proof from naval sources of such service: *Provided*, That an honorable discharge from the Navy, Marine Corps, or the naval auxiliary service, or an ordinary discharge with recommendation for reenlistment shall be accepted as proof of good moral character: *Provided further*, That any court which now has or may hereafter be given jurisdiction to naturalize aliens as citizens of the United States may immediately naturalize any alien applying under and furnishing the proof prescribed by the foregoing provision.

SECTION 2166. Any alien of the age of twenty-one years and upward, who has enlisted or may hereafter enlist in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, or in the volunteer forces, and has been or may hereafter be honorably discharged, shall be admitted

to become a citizen of the United States upon his petition, and shall not be required to prove residence within the United States previous to his application to become such citizen, and the court admitting such alien shall be satisfied in respect to the moral character of the applicant by competent proof of such person having been honorably discharged from the military or naval service of the United States at the expiration of a legal term of enlistment.

Mr. ELVINS. An old soldier, for example, under the provisions of your bill would have to make a declaration of intention to become a citizen. Why do you think it necessary that he should have one year's residence in some State?

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is a matter provided for by law now, and I did not attempt to pass any opinion on it. What do you mean, why do I think he should not reside there?

Mr. ELVINS. You have provided that he should?

Mr. CAMPBELL. In the bill he is exempted from that provision.

Mr. ELVINS. No; I am talking about one who served prior to 1870

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, I heard no suggestion made in regard to that.

Mr. ELVINS. You exempt those now in the military or naval service, or who have been within six months, but you put it upon one who served prior to 1870?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I left that matter just as it stood. I was advised to make only certain exceptions in their behalf.

Mr. ELVINS. To put the question another way, What objection would there be to giving to the old soldier the same exemption from the one year's residence in a State that is given to a man now in the service?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have no objection whatever.

Mr. ELVINS. Would there be any valid objection?

Mr. CAMPBELL. No; I do not know that there would be. I have never given that subject any particular consideration. The reason, of course, does not apply in that case. In the other instances, while the courts are given jurisdiction irrespective of the fact that the petitioner has not resided in their jurisdiction for the statutory period of twelve months, because they can not in view of the duties they perform comply with the provision. That is the only reason they are exempted. The real exemption is from the declaration, and that refers both to those serving prior to 1870 and since.

Mr. ELVINS. Here is my point. The bill makes provision for the naturalization of soldiers and sailors who are now in the service, and the provision to which I refer is that they do not have to live within the State for a year before they become citizens. That is also true of one who is honorably discharged from the service if he makes application within six months, but as to the old soldiers who served prior to 1870, they must live within the State one year and also file their petition, and I asked Mr. Campbell if there was any good reason why they should not be given the exemption.

Mr. HAYES. What is the objection to that?

Mr. ELVINS. The objection is that I have some men in my country to which this provision would apply who have not been residents of the State a year. They are just as much entitled to become citizens as anybody else.

Mr. EDWARDS. There is not any reason why it should apply to that class.

Mr. HAYES. The same reason does not exist. The reason for doing away with that requirement in the case of the soldier or sailor,

as Mr. Campbell has already explained, is because the very nature of their duties makes it impossible for them to do it.

Mr. ELVINS. But after he is out of the service entirely he can do so at any time within six months.

Mr. HAYES. I think that is a little long.

Mr. BENNET. I move that the bill which has been presented by Mr. Campbell be printed for the use of the committee and that we hold a meeting on Friday to consider naturalization matters and request Mr. Campbell, if he can do so, to be with us.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I will be present, with pleasure.

Mr. ELVINS. And that the new legislation proposed by the bill be distinguished some way in the print, either by underscoring or otherwise.

Mr. BENNET. I accept the suggestion of Mr. Elvins.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is done in the typewritten copy which I have here.

(The motion was agreed to.)

(Thereupon the committee proceeded to the consideration of executive business, after which it adjourned.)

HEARINGS ON IMMIGRATION BILLS.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
March 4, 1910.

Representative Howell, chairman of the committee, received, through Mr. John J. D. Trenor, of New York City, former chairman of the committee on immigration of the National Board of Trade, a symposium on the general subject of immigration. It consisted of three queries, as follows:

1. Has immigration in the past proved beneficial or otherwise?
2. Has it now reached a point where it would constitute a menace to American labor? If so, what remedy would you suggest?
3. In your opinion, would an intelligent distribution of immigration under the direction of the federal authorities, in conjunction with those of the various States, tend to offset the evils of alleged excessive immigration?

To these three queries 93 replies were received by Mr. Trenor, joint author of *The Italian in America*. The letter transmitting the copies of the replies, together with the copies of the letters, with an index preceding them, follow:

No. A.]

NATIONAL BOARD OF TRADE,
COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, 1140 FIFTEENTH ST. NW.,
Washington, D. C., February 18, 1910.

HON. BENJAMIN HOWELL,
*Chairman Committee on Immigration,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: At the request of Mr. Frank D. La Lanne, president of the National Board of Trade, I have the honor to transmit herewith 93 copies of correspondence on the subject of immigration, together with a letter addressed to Mr. La Lanne by Mr. John J. D. Trenor, who as chairman of the committee on immigration of the National Board of Trade voluntarily undertook the investigation, which covered a broad ground.

The results of his work as embodied in the replies referred to are sent to your honorable committee in the hope and belief that they may, in a measure at least, tend to assist it in arriving at a conservative conclusion on a subject of such moment.

It seems almost needless to add that the National Board of Trade has always manifested a keen interest in the subject of immigration, which has formed the basis of various resolutions passed at its annual sessions.

To illustrate this I beg to append a copy of the resolutions passed at its last annual sessions in this city, held on January 25, 26, and 27, 1910.

XXV. IMMIGRATION.

Whereas the United States Government from its inception has extended a welcome to worthy immigrants from almost every country; and

Whereas immigration from foreign countries has furnished much of the necessary labor and largely contributed to the development of the United States; and

Whereas immigration has been a great factor in populating this great country, developing its resources, and building up its manufacturing interests; and

Whereas immigrant labor is still greatly needed in the development of the South and West and in furnishing labor to the manufacturing plants of the East: Therefore

Resolved, That the National Board of Trade is in favor of continuing immigration of those in good health, of good moral character and intelligence, and who are not dependents, and it is opposed to the so-called educational tests.

I am further requested by Mr. La Lanne to state that should your honorable committee desire his presence to speak in connection with this subject, he will be happy to come on at any time, previous notice being sent him at 214 Chestnut street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Should the honorable committee deem it necessary to inspect the original letters, Mr. Trenor, whose address is "The Whitehall Building, New York City," will gladly comply in person with the committee's request.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, yours,

(Signed)

ALBERT M. READ,
Commissioner.

No. B.]

J. J. D. TRENOR. THE WHITEHALL BUILDING,
New York, January 12, 1910.

FRANK D. LA LANNE, Esq.,

President National Board of Trade, Philadelphia, Pa.

MY DEAR MR. LA LANNE: In view of the interest which the National Board of Trade has always taken in the subject of immigration, and fulfilling the promise made while I was chairman of its committee on immigration to canvass the matter with various interests in the country, I have the honor to send you herewith a copy of the circular letter issued by me, together with copies of the replies received thereto, 94 in all.

These answers come from governors of various States, boards of trade, railroad presidents, Cardinal Gibbons, and many other persons of standing in the community.

In summarizing the replies, it may be stated, as a general proposition, that the following premises have been established:

1. That the general effect of immigration to this country has been beneficial.

2. That immigration so far has not constituted a menace to American labor.

3. That it is still needed for our industrial and commercial development.

4. That a comprehensive plan of distribution, under the direction of the federal authorities, in cooperation with those of the various States, is most desirable, and would tend to obviate the evils of congestion in our larger cities.

In view of the fact that the Joint Congressional Commission on immigration was engaged in its investigations, I deemed it inexpedient to transmit this correspondence to you until the present time, when the issue is a live one.

I trust it may prove of interest to the National Board of Trade and aid it somewhat in its deliberations on the immigration problem.

The joint congressional commission will be furnished with copies of the letters referred to.

It is my purpose to be in Washington unofficially on the 24th, 25th, 26th, and 27th instants, when I shall be glad to cooperate in any way that may prove of service to the National Board of Trade.

Very truly, yours,

(Signed)

JNO. J. D. TRENOR.

[Copy.]

No. C.]

JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
PRODUCE EXCHANGE BUILDING,
New York, May —, 1907.

DEAR SIR: As a member of the National Board of Trade and its committee on immigration, I have been asked by the president of that body to aid in such work as might prove of service to the board in its deliberations in connection with the question of immigration, so that the recommendations made by it to Congress may receive that attention to which timely and well-considered propositions are entitled.

I may be permitted to remark that I have devoted much time and thought to the subject named and the problems growing out of it and was the joint author of the work entitled "The Italian in America," which received much consideration from many members of both branches of Congress and the press generally, some two years ago.

Being desirous of adding to my possibly limited information upon the matter, I have taken the liberty of intruding on your valuable time in the hope that you will kindly favor me with replies to the following queries:

1. Has the general influence of immigration to your State in recent years been beneficial or otherwise?

2. In your opinion has the tide of immigration reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer? If so, what method of restriction would you suggest?

3. Do you, or do you not, think that the fostering of an intelligent plan of distribution by the federal authorities in conjunction with those of the various States would, by relieving the congestion in our larger cities, tend to solve the problem of alleged excessive immigration?

If in your opinion immigration is needed in your State, is it required for the development of your agricultural as well as your industrial resources?

The assurance that your reply would be of value in assisting us to a comprehensive view of the situation in all its bearings must serve as my apology for this intrusion.

Very respectfully, yours,

(Signed)

JNO. J. D. TRENOR.

No. D.]

Index of replies received by Mr. John J. D. Trenor, in answer to queries propounded by him.

[Arranged in order of States and cities.]

No.	State.	City.	From whom received.
1	Alabama.....	Montgomery.....	Hon. B. B. Comer, governor.
2	do.....	Mobile.....	Hon. Pat. J. Lyons, mayor.
3	do.....	do.....	Chamber of commerce.
4	do.....	Montgomery.....	J. S. Pinchard, esq., chairman committee on immigration, Commercial Club.
5	do.....	do.....	O. O. Nelson, esq., of Holt, Nelson & Holt.
6	Arkansas.....	Little Rock.....	Little Rock Board of Trade.
7	do.....	do.....	W. M. Kavanaugh, esq., of the Southern Trust Co.
8	California.....	Sacramento.....	Hon. M. R. Beard, mayor.
9	do.....	San Francisco.....	C. H. Bentley, esq., president the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco.
10	Colorado.....	Denver.....	Hon. Henry A. Buchtel, governor of the State of Colorado.
11	do.....	do.....	The Denver Chamber of Commerce and Board of Trade.
12	Connecticut.....	Hartford.....	His excellency, Governor Woodruff, by Chas. E. Julin, executive secretary.
13	do.....	do.....	Hartford Chamber of Commerce.
14	Delaware.....	Dover.....	His Excellency Governor Lea, by Wesley Webb, corresponding secretary of the state board of agriculture.
15	do.....	Wilmington.....	Hon. Horace Wilson, mayor.
16	Georgia.....	Atlanta.....	Atlanta Chamber of Commerce.
17	do.....	Augusta.....	Thos. K. Scott, esq., general manager Georgia Railroad.
18	do.....	Macon.....	S. F. Parrott, esq., vice-president Georgia Southern and Florida Ry. Company.
19	do.....	do.....	J. F. Hanson, esq., president Central of Georgia Railway Company.
20	do.....	Savannah.....	W. W. Williamson, esq., president the Savannah Chamber of Commerce.
21	Idaho.....	Boise.....	Hon. F. R. Gooding, governor of the State of Idaho.
22	Illinois.....	Chicago.....	Geo. B. Harris, esq., president Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railway Company.
23	do.....	do.....	S. M. Felton, esq., president the Chicago and Alton R. R. Company.
24	do.....	do.....	E. P. Ripley, esq., president the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Ry. system.
25	do.....	do.....	Rock Island lines, bureau of immigration.
26	do.....	do.....	J. T. Harahan, esq., president Illinois Central R. R. Company.
27	do.....	Springfield.....	David Ross, esq., secretary bureau of labor statistics, by direction of Governor Deneen.
28	Iowa.....	Des Moines.....	Hon. Albert B. Cummins, governor of the State of Iowa.
29	Kansas.....	Topeka.....	Hon. E. W. Hoch, governor of the State of Kansas.
30	do.....	do.....	The Commercial Club of Topeka.
31	Kentucky.....	Maysville.....	Hon. William H. Cox, state senator.
32	Louisiana.....	New Orleans.....	Louisiana state board of agriculture and immigration.
33	Maine.....	Augusta.....	Bureau of industrial and labor statistics, State of Maine, by direction of Governor Cobb.
34	Maryland.....	Baltimore.....	His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, by W. T. Russel, secretary.
35	Massachusetts.....	Boston.....	Lucius Tuttle, esq., president Maine Central R. R. Co.
36	do.....	do.....	The Boston Chamber of Commerce.
37	do.....	Holyoke.....	Hon. Nathan P. Avery, mayor.
38	Michigan.....	Detroit.....	Detroit Board of Commerce.
39	do.....	Grand Rapids.....	Grand Rapids Board of Trade.
40	do.....	Marquette.....	Duluth, South Shore and Atlantic Ry. Co., Mineral Range R. R. Co.
41	Minnesota.....	St. Paul.....	Hon. John F. Johnson, governor of the State of Minnesota.
42	do.....	Minneapolis.....	Hon. J. C. Haynes, mayor.
43	do.....	do.....	The public affairs committee of the Commercial Club.
44	do.....	St. Paul.....	Bureau of labor of the State of Minnesota.
45	do.....	do.....	James J. Hill, esq., president Great Northern Ry. Co.
46	do.....	do.....	A. B. Stickney, esq., president Chicago Great Western Ry. Co.
47	do.....	Minneapolis.....	E. Pennington, esq., vice-president and general manager Minneapolis, St. Paul and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.
48	Missouri.....	Jefferson City.....	Bureau of labor statistics of the State of Missouri, by direction of Hon. Joseph W. Folk, governor of the State of Missouri.
49	do.....	Kansas City.....	Hon. H. M. Beardsley, mayor.
50	Nebraska.....	Lincoln.....	Hon. George L. Sheldon, governor of the State of Nebraska.
51	New Jersey.....	Trenton.....	Hon. E. C. Stokes, governor of the State of New Jersey.
52	do.....	Newark.....	Hon. Jacob Haussling, mayor.
53	do.....	do.....	The board of trade of the city of Newark, N. J.
54	do.....	Trenton.....	Hon. F. W. Gnichtel, mayor.
55	New York.....	Albany.....	Albany Chamber of Commerce.
56	do.....	Binghamton.....	Hon. H. H. Woodbury, mayor.
57	do.....	Elmira.....	Hon. Z. R. Brockway, mayor.
58	do.....	New York.....	W. H. Truesdale, esq., president Delaware, Lackawanna and Western R. R. Co.

Index of replies received by Mr. John J. D. Trenor, in answer to queries propounded by him .

[Arranged in order of States and cities.]

No.	State.	City.	From whom received.
59	New York	New York	James Quinlan, esq., president Greenwich Savings Bank.
60do.....do.....	The Rt. Rev. Henry C. Potter, bishop Protestant Episcopal Diocese of New York.
61do.....do.....	Frederick D. Underwood, esq., president Erie Railroad.
62do.....do.....	T. P. Fowler, esq., of the New York, Ontario and Western R. R. Co.
63do.....	Rome.....	Rome Board of Trade.
64do.....	Schenectady.....	Hon. Jacob W. Clute, mayor.
65do.....do.....	Andrew V. Raymond, esq., president Union College.
66do.....	Syracuse.....	Syracuse Chamber of Commerce.
67do.....	Troy.....	Hon. Elias P. Mann, mayor.
68	North Dakota.....	Bismarck.....	Hon. John Burke, governor of the State of North Dakota.
69	Ohio.....	Columbus.....	Hon. Andrew L. Harris, governor of the State of Ohio, by S. J. Flickinger, secretary.
70do.....	Cleveland.....	Hon. Tom L. Johnson.
71do.....	Columbus.....	F. B. Sheldon, esq., assistant to president the Hocking Valley Rwy. Co.
72do.....	Dayton.....	The Dayton Chamber of Commerce.
73do.....	Toledo.....	Hon. Brand Whitlock, mayor.
74	Oregon.....	Salem.....	Hon. Geo. E. Chamberlain, governor of the State of Oregon.
75	Pennsylvania.....	Harrisburg.....	The Harrisburg Board of Trade.
76do.....	Philadelphia.....	Sam'l Rea, esq., third vice-president the Pennsylvania Railroad Company.
77do.....	Pittsburg.....	Albert M. Hauauer, esq., of the P. H. Hamberger Co.
78	Rhode Island.....	Providence.....	Hon. James H. Higgins, governor of the State of Rhode Island.
79	South Carolina.....	Charleston.....	Hon. R. G. Rhett, mayor.
80do.....	Columbia.....	Department of agriculture, commerce, and immigration of the State of South Carolina, by direction of the governor of the State of South Carolina.
81	South Dakota.....	Pierre.....	Hon. Coe I. Crawford, governor of the State of South Dakota.
82	Tennessee.....	Nashville.....	Hon. T. O. Morris, mayor.
83	Texas.....	Austin.....	Department of agriculture, insurance, statistics, and history of the State of Texas.
84do.....	Houston.....	The Houston and Texas Central R. R. Co.
85do.....	San Antonio.....	San Antonio and Aransas Pass Ry. Co.
86	Utah.....	Salt Lake City.....	Hon. John C. Cutler, governor of the State of Utah.
87	Virginia.....	Norfolk.....	L. Sevier, esq., vice-president, Seaboard Air Line Ry.
88do.....	Richmond.....	Hon. Carlton McCarthy, mayor.
89do.....do.....	George W. Stevens, esq., president Chesapeake and Ohio Ry. Co.
90do.....	Roanoke.....	L. E. Johnson, esq., president, Norfolk and Western Ry. Co.
91	Wisconsin.....	Madison.....	Bureau of labor and industrial statistics of the State of Wisconsin by direction of Governor James O. Davidson.
92do.....	Milwaukee.....	Wisconsin Central R. R., by William H. Killen, land and industrial commissioner.
93	Wyoming.....	Cheyenne.....	Hon. B. B. Brooks, governor of the State of Wyoming.

[Copy.]

No. 1.] CHIEF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, ALABAMA,
Montgomery, May 22, 1907.

Hon. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
Produce Exchange Building, New York City.

DEAR SIR: Yours of the 13th received and carefully noted.
Answering your questions seriatim. will say that in my opinion the influence of immigration to our State in recent years has been beneficial. Second. The tide of immigration has not reached a point where it is a menace, and think it would be to our interest to increase the number. Third. I think that an intelligent distribution by the federal authorities in conjunction with those of the State would be beneficial. We have never had an excess of immigrants, and they are needed both in development of agricultural and industrial resources.

With regards, I am, yours, very truly,
(Signed) B. B. COMER.

[Copy.]

No. 2.]

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
City of Mobile, Ala., May 30, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,

Produce Exchange Building, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of the 23d. I have gone over the work, entitled "The Italian in America;" and was glad to note that this much-villified race met with some measure of vindication therein. Our Italian immigrants are peaceful, law abiding, industrious people, who have done no little toward the building up of this section.

Answering your questions as they are set out, I beg to say:

1. I wish to say emphatically that the immigration to our State, and especially the counties in this locality, has been very beneficial.

2. The immigrants we have received have in no way interfered with any material interest: in fact, we need many more than have come here.

3. I think it would be well for the federal authorities to take in hand the distribution of immigrants, thus relieving congestion in the large cities and aiding the progress of those sections needing immigration for their development. More immigration is certainly needed in this State to develop our agricultural and industrial resources, especially the former.

Yours, very truly,

(Signed)

PAT. J. LYONS, *Mayor.*

No. 3.]

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, MOBILE, ALA.

In answer to my letter of May 15, 1907, the president of the Chamber of Commerce, Mobile, Ala., replied as follows:

Question 1. Has the general influence of immigration to your State in recent years been beneficial or otherwise?

Answer. Good.

Question 2. In your opinion, has the tide of immigration reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer?

Answer. Not in this State.

Question 3. Do you, or do you not, think that the fostering of an intelligent plan of distribution by the Federal authorities, in conjunction with those of the various States, would, by relieving the congestion in our larger cities, tend to solve the problem of alleged excessive immigration?

Answer. I do.

Question 4. If in your opinion immigration is needed in your State, is it required for the development of your agricultural as well as your industrial resources?

Answer. Yes; very largely.

[Copy.]

No. 4.]

THE STATE ABSTRACT COMPANY,
Montgomery, Ala., May 25, 1907.

JNO. J. D. TRENOR, Esq.,

Produce Exchange Building, New York City.

DEAR SIR: Yours of the 15th addressed to the president chamber of commerce, Montgomery, Ala., was referred by the secretary of our Commercial Club to me for answer. I have been chairman of the committee on immigration of the Commercial Club for a couple of years

and in this capacity have endeavored as best I could to consider the problem of immigration into Alabama in all its bearings.

Our committee is hopelessly divided as to just what should be the policy of the State on this question. Some of us think that the influx of foreigners into the United States should be limited. All of us think that some kind of physical, property, and educational test should be applied as a requisite for admission. The committee seems to be in favor of restricting the importation of foreign citizens to the northern countries of Europe, or, to speak more accurately, to excluding the undesirable element from southern Italy and one or two other undesirable sections.

Answering your questions seriatim, I would say, speaking for myself and for the committee of the Commercial Club, as nearly as I can approximately:

First. The general influence of immigration into Alabama in recent years has been beneficial.

Second. The tide of immigration into this State has not reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the Alabama laborer and should not be restricted for this reason.

Third. In our opinion, the fostering of an intelligent plan of distribution by the federal authorities in conjunction with the various States, in order that immigrants might be distributed to different sections and sent to districts in which they could obtain congenial employment, would tend to solve the problem of excessive immigration to the congestive districts and would be of great and lasting advantage to this section of the United States.

Fourth. Immigration is needed to this State for the development of all kinds of industries. We have a great deal of undeveloped agricultural land and a climate and soil highly adapted to agricultural pursuits. The mining, manufacturing, and industrial sections of the State need desirable immigrants and could use a large number of them, but in our judgment the agricultural districts of Alabama afford an equal if not a greater inducement to the home seekers of other sections.

As chairman of the committee on immigration, I would be delighted to furnish you any data at hand concerning the resources of Alabama and the inducements that are offered to desirable immigrants to locate here.

Very respectfully,

(Signed) J. S. PINCHARD,
Chairman Committee on Immigration,
Commercial Club, Montgomery, Ala.

[Copy.]

No. 5.]

HOLT, NELSON & HOLT,
Montgomery, Ala., April 18, 1907.

Mr. JNO. J. D. TRENOR,
New York.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your esteemed favor under date April 13, and I consider the committee fortunate to number among its members one who understands and appreciates the situation so thoroughly.

It is unquestionably a fact that the industries of our cities of the South are continually drawing upon our farms for labor which is not being replaced, and the only solution of the problem for this section of the country seems to be immigration. It certainly is not true that immigration has become a menace to the southern laborer as I see it. Roughly speaking, I believe we could give employment to twice the number of laborers we now have.

Unfortunately for us comparatively few in this section seem to be alive to the situation, and most of them are in ignorance of the amendments recently passed.

If you are at any time in this part of the country, I believe it would be beneficial to our cause for you to address our people. I have only recently received a letter from our president, notifying me of my appointment as a member of this committee. I have formulated no plans, and would appreciate any suggestions from you.

Thanking you for your kind letter, I beg to remain,

Very truly, yours,

(Signed)

O. O. NELSON.

[Copy.]

No. 6.]

BOARD OF TRADE,
Little Rock, May 21, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
New York City, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Your favor of May 15, on the subject of immigration is having our attention, and we want to thank you in advance for your kindness and thoughtfulness in directing your attention to us. We have recently received letters of similar purport from the National Business League of Chicago and Mr. Sebastian, passenger traffic manager of the Rock Island Railway, also of Chicago.

I will undertake to answer your interesting interrogations in the same order in which you presented them:

1. The general influence of immigrants to this State in recent years has been decidedly beneficial.

2. In my opinion the tide of immigration has by no means reached the point where it constitutes a menace to the interest of the American laborer. The farmer, the sawmill, and the mine owners are crying out for labor. We need them in all parts of the State for the development of our natural resources, on our farms and in our factories.

3. I think that there should be joint action on the part of the Federal Government and that of various States by means of which immigrants could be sent where their services are needed, where they would do well, would acquire homes and become true American citizens.

Immigration is largely needed in our State for the development of our agriculture, and you should remember in this State that it is only in the cotton belt where the negro labor exceeds numerically the white labor.

German Catholic immigrants and Italians do well in Arkansas. In a few years they own their places and make splendid citizens. I can give you a list of their colonies at any time you may desire the information.

Yours, truly,

(Signed)

GEO. R. BROWN,
Secretary.

[Copy.]

No. 7.]

SOUTHERN TRUST COMPANY,
Little Rock, Ark., May 28, 1907.

Mr. JNO. J. D. TRENOR,
New York.

DEAR SIR: I am informed by Mr. George R. Brown, secretary of the Little Rock Board of Trade, that you desire some information as to the demand for labor in this State. In regard to this matter I desire to say that this class of labor was very unsatisfactory, and, if possible, we are going to get other laborers to take their places.

Our climate is mild. It does not get too warm in the summer, and our winters are not very severe. In my opinion, the laborers are better protected than in any other section of the country. Under our laws the public schools are maintained so that the children of the poor people have the same advantages of education as the rich people. Our people are law-abiding, and our government affords every protection to the law-abiding citizen. If you would like some further information on the subject, I would be more than glad to supply you with it.

Very truly, yours,

(Signed)

W. M. KAVANAUGH.

[Copy.]

No. 8.]

CITY OF SACRAMENTO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
Mayor's Office. May 29, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your favor of the 23d instant I beg to say:

Question 1. The white immigration to this section of the State has not been great, its influence though small, I think has been beneficial. The immigration from China and Japan, especially the latter, is generally held to be undesirable and we favor restriction.

Question 2. I should say "no" as regards this State.

Question 3. The congestion in our larger cities would be relieved, no doubt, by federal and state distribution, but I doubt its tendency to solve the problem of alleged excessive immigration.

Question 4. The immigration to this State is required for both industrial and agricultural development, but particularly for the latter.

Very truly, yours,

(Signed)

M. R. BEARD.

[Copy.]

No. 9.]

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF SAN FRANCISCO,
May 23, 1907.

JOHN J. D. TRENOR, Esq.,

Produce Exchange Building, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Your esteemed inquiry of the 15th instant relating to the question of immigration has had my careful consideration. You do not indicate to what extent you wish me to discuss these questions, but I beg to assure you of my deep interest in the matter and of my gratification that these important questions are having the serious consideration of the National Board of Trade.

Query No. 1. The general influence of immigration to our State in recent years has been beneficial.

Query No. 2. In my opinion, the tide of immigration has not reached the point of menacing the interests of the American laborer from a merely commercial standpoint. I believe that it has unquestionably become a menace to the political and social welfare of our whole people. It occurs to me that the dangers may be prevented by requiring evidence as to the character of the immigrant. Could not a certificate be demanded, signed by competent officials from the country from which the immigrant comes, showing that he has never been convicted of crime; that he has never been a charge by reason of illness, poverty, or infirmity, and requiring that this certificate cover a period of years prior to the date of presentation?

Query No. 3. A distribution of immigrants, which would relieve congestion in the larger cities, would, in my opinion, tend to solve the difficulties. In California there is great need of immigration for the development of our natural and agricultural resources, nearly all of which are developed during the summer and fall months. There is comparatively little manufacturing. Our foreign immigrants are almost entirely Chinese and Japanese. Their use has been a natural, if not a necessary, development, as they rarely have families and seem able to shift for themselves during a considerable period of the year. The antagonism to Orientals in California comes from the large cities, where they live quite apart—are unassimilable. Their peculiar forms of vice give many and lucrative opportunities for corrupting the police, the police courts, and the entire municipal government. If the Orientals could be sent directly to the agricultural districts in California and kept away from the larger cities, much relief would be afforded to the agricultural needs, and the sound objections to their immigration would be removed to a large extent.

Yours, very truly,

(Signed)

C. H. BENTLEY, *President.*

[Copy.]

No. 10.]

STATE OF COLORADO,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Denver, May 17, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
Produce Exchange Building, New York City.

MY DEAR SIR: I have your letter of May 13 and make haste to answer.

1. Your first question can not be answered easily. We have had a few immigrants who were a distinct harm to the life of our people. For the most part, however, the foreign people who have come to us have been an advantage to the State.

2. I do not think the tide of immigration has reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer in this State. We have needed 15,000 laborers for our mines and mills and farms during the last six months who could not be secured from any quarter whatsoever.

3. I think it would be quite desirable that the federal authorities should cooperate with the States in relieving the congestion in the larger cities. We very much need wholesome and purposeful people for the development of the agricultural resources of this State. It is difficult to find a supply of men for our coal mines and for our metal-liferous mines and for our farms.

Yours, very respectfully,

(Signed)

HENRY A. BUCHTEL.

[Copy.]

No. 11.]

THE DENVER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
AND BOARD OF TRADE,
May 20, 1907.

Mr. JNO. J. D. TRENOR,
Produce Exchange Building, New York City.

DEAR SIR: In reply to yours of the 15th instant, the president of our chamber desires me to reply to your questions as follows:

First. Has the general influence of immigration to your State in recent years been beneficial or otherwise?—Beneficial.

Second. In your opinion, has the tide of immigration reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer; if so, what method of restriction would you suggest?—It has not reached such a point.

Third. Do you, or do you not think that the fostering of an intelligent plan of distribution by the federal authorities in conjunction with those of the various States, would by relieving the congestion in our larger cities, tend to solve the problem of alleged excessive immigration?—It might.

Fourth. If, in your opinion, immigration is needed in your State, is it required for the development of your agricultural as well as your industrial resources?—It will assist materially in the development of our agricultural, mineral, and industrial resources.

Yours, very truly,

(Signed)

ARTHUR WILLIAMS,
Secretary.

[Copy.]

No. 12.]

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Hartford, May 22, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
Produce Exchange Building, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I am directed by His Excellency Governor Woodruff to say, in reply to your recent letter concerning the question of immigration, that in his opinion the general influence of immigration upon this State has been beneficial.

The governor does not believe that the tide of immigration has reached a point yet where it constitutes a menace to the interests of American labor. He does believe that an intelligent distribution of immigration by federal authorities, in conjunction with those of various States, would be beneficial and would tend to solve the problems that excessive immigration creates.

He believes that immigration is beneficial, especially to the agricultural interests of Connecticut.

I have the honor to remain,

Very truly, yours,

(Signed)

CHAS. E. JULIN,
Executive Secretary.

No. 13.]

HARTFORD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

In answer to my letter of May 15, 1907, the president of the Hartford Chamber of Commerce replied as follows:

Question 1. Has the general influence of immigration to your State in recent years been beneficial or otherwise?

Answer. Yes; beneficial.

Question 2. In your opinion has the tide of immigration reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer? If so, what method of restriction would you suggest?

Answer. No. If possible, to so restrict it as to allow workers to come in, but to keep out drones and agitators and criminals.

Question 3. Do you, or do you not, think that the fostering of an intelligent plan of distribution by the federal authorities in conjunction with those of the various States would, by relieving the congestion in the larger cities, tend to solve the problem of alleged excessive immigration?

Answer. I do.

Question 4. If, in your opinion, immigration is needed in your State, is it required for the development of your agricultural as well as your industrial resources?

Answer. It is required for both lines, as well as servants, but especially in the agricultural sections.

[Copy.]

No. 14.]

THE STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE,
*Dover, Del., May 22, 1907.*Hon. J. J. D. TRENOR,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of May 13 to Governor Lea has been referred to this office for reply. In answer to your inquiry, I beg to say that Delaware has scarcely been touched by the tide of immigration in recent years, or at any time in our history. The comparatively small number of aliens who have come to Delaware have become industrious and useful citizens. From our own conditions, then, I would say that the tide of immigration has not reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer.

From my limited knowledge I should certainly think that the fostering of an intelligent plan of distribution by the federal authorities in conjunction with those of the various States would tend to solve the problem of excessive immigration. Laborers are urgently needed in Delaware for the development of our agricultural resources.

Very truly, yours,

(Signed)

WESLEY WEBB,
Corresponding Secretary.

[Copy.]

No. 15.]

CITY OF WILMINGTON, DEL., *May 25, 1907.*Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
Produce Exchange Building, New York City.

DEAR SIR: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 23d instant making sundry inquiries about immigration, and answer your letter as follows:

1. Has the general influence of immigration to your State in recent years been beneficial or otherwise?

Answer. It has been beneficial.

2. In your opinion has the tide of immigration reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer? If so, what method of restriction would you suggest?

Answer. I do not find in this locality that labor has been injured by immigration.

3. Do you, or do you not, think that the fostering of an intelligent plan of distribution by the federal authorities in conjunction with those of the various States would, by relieving the congestion in our larger cities, tend to solve the problem of alleged excessive immigration?

Answer. I do.

4. If in your opinion immigration is needed in your State, is it required for the development of your agricultural as well as your industrial resources?

Answer. It is required more for our agricultural than industrial.

Yours, very truly,

(Signed)

HORACE WILSON,
Mayor.

[Copy.]

No. 16.]

ATLANTA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
*Atlanta, Ga., May 20, 1907.*Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
Produce Exchange Building, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your letter of May 15:

Georgia has had practically no immigration for two generations. The census of 1900 showed that the population was more than 99 per cent native born.

Last year about 700 immigrants, who had drifted away from New York, found their way to Georgia. These are largely Greeks, Italians, and Russian Jews, with a sprinkling of Scotch, English, and Scandinavians.

It seems to be a sound proposition that immigrants would do better to spread over a productive soil, under fairly sanitary conditions, with good moral surroundings, than they could possibly do when herded in the slums of the great cities.

Immigration or some other source of supply for labor is needed in our State. During the past year it was estimated that one-tenth the cotton machinery of the State was idle because labor could not be found to run it. This meant a loss of at least \$400,000 a year in net earnings. The opinion of manufacturers who have looked into this subject is that other industries are as far short of labor as the cotton industry.

Yours, very truly, (Signed) J. W. POPE,
President.

[Copy.]

No. 17.]

GEORGIA RAILROAD,
GENERAL MANAGER'S OFFICE,
*Augusta, Ga., May 27, 1907.*Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
Produce Exchange Building, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of May 20 was duly received. Regret my inability to reply earlier.

In reply to your first question: There has been too little immigration to Georgia for its effect to be felt except as stated in my last paragraph. The state authorities are now acting, but it remains to be seen what they can accomplish.

In answer to your second question: In my opinion immigration does not constitute a menace to the interests of the American laborer, my information being that in almost all parts of the country manufacturing and industrial enterprises, and some departments of railroad work, are suffering for want of sufficient forces.

My information is insufficient to enable me to discuss the plan of distribution indicated in the first part of your third question. Replying to the latter part of it: My opinion is that this State needs more laborers in the mills, because the majority of them are only able to run 75 or 80 per cent of their machinery, and more farm laborers, because there are vast areas of tillable land uncultivated.

In answer to your postscript: According to my observation, the great majority of immigrants who have come into this State within the last few years from States lying north of us have made good citizens, and, generally, good industrial workers; therefore the effect has been beneficial, but it must be borne in mind that the movement has been slow, and the number of immigrants comparatively small.

Very truly, yours,

(Signed)

THOS. K. SCOTT.

[Copy.]

No. 18.]

GEORGIA SOUTHERN AND FLORIDA RAILWAY COMPANY,
Macon, Ga., May 28, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
Produce Exchange Building, New York.

DEAR SIR: I have your favor of May 20, and in reply beg to answer as follows:

1. Immigration to the States of Georgia and Florida has been so limited in recent years that it is difficult to state whether it has been beneficial or otherwise. However, whatever effect it has had has been beneficial, I think.

2. The tide of immigration to the Southeast has not reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer. Every laborer who desires work can secure it in this section at remunerative rates of pay.

3. I think that industrious immigrants are needed in this State and in the State of Florida, both in connection with agricultural and industrial work.

Yours, very truly,

(Signed)

S. F. PARROTT,
Vice-President.

[Copy.]

No. 19.]

CENTRAL OF GEORGIA RAILWAY COMPANY,
(At New York.) Macon, Ga., May 25, 1907.

JOHN J. D. TRENOR, Esq.,
Produce Exchange Building, New York City.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of May 20:

1. There has been too little immigration to our territory for us to form a definite opinion with reference to its value. There seems, no doubt, however, that it is very desirable for us to secure a good class of immigrants.

2. I do not think that immigration has reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the American laborer, because there is a demand for labor in all departments far in excess of the supply. It is also true that many American laborers, since the great advance in wages, do not work full time. The development of the territory of this company has been limited to the labor supply for a long period.

If we had had more labor, or if the labor in the territory had worked regularly, the effect upon the situation would have been quite apparent.

3. I am unable to express an opinion of any value with reference to fostering an intelligent plan of distribution by the federal authorities in conjunction with those of the various States for relieving the congestion in our larger cities by the distribution of excessive immigration. I have very grave doubts of ever converting into good laborers a large percentage of immigrants that are coming into this country and settling in our cities. Those who are disposed to work find it more desirable to accept employment in the large cities than to go to the smaller ones or to the country. Immigration, I am sure, is needed in our State, and it is required for the development of our agricultural as well as other industrial resources.

Yours, very truly,

(Signed)

J. F. HANSON,
President.

[Copy.]

No. 20.]

THE SAVANNAH CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Savannah, Ga., May 25, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,

Produce Exchange Building, New York.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your letter of the 15th instant, I will answer your questions as nearly as I can as follows:

First. The immigration to Georgia up to the present year has been small in number, but this year, owing to concerted action through the entire State, it is assuming some volume, and as labor is badly needed it has been decidedly beneficial.

Second. I do not think the tide of immigration has reached the point where it has become a menace to the American laborer. With the rapid development of the country good labor is needed everywhere.

Third. The congestion of immigration in New York City should be relieved by a proper distribution through other ports. I am glad to see the movement increasing through Baltimore, Galveston, and New Orleans, and I am confident by next fall the movement will start through Savannah. Immigrants are badly wanted in this State for both agricultural and industrial pursuits.

Yours, very truly,

(Signed)

W. W. WILLIAMSON,
President.

[Copy.]

No. 21.]

STATE OF IDAHO,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Boise, May 31, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
Produce Exchange Building, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Answering the questions contained in your letter of May 13, permit me to say:

1. The immigration to this State within recent years has been of the best possible character. I will explain that immigration, when the term is applied to Idaho, only in the smallest possible sense means foreign immigration. Nearly all the people coming to this State are from the Middle West and from surrounding Pacific Coast States and western Canada.

2. I feel that the tide of immigration is reaching a stage where it will soon become a menace, not so much to the interests of the laborer as to the life and integrity of the nation.

3. Answering the second paragraph of your question, I am anxious to see this State secure immigrants, especially of the agricultural class. The State has a large area of productive land, which is awaiting, first, the employment of capital in the construction of canals and the development of power plants and the erection and maintaining of sugar mills, woolen mills, and other manufacturing plants; and, second, the cultivation of these lands by practical farmers.

I can assure you that I heartily appreciate the importance of the work in which you are engaged, and trust your efforts and those of your associates may be entirely successful.

Respectfully,

(Signed) F. R. GOODING.

[Copy.]

No. 22.]

CHICAGO, BURLINGTON AND
QUINCY RAILWAY COMPANY,
OFFICE OF PRESIDENT,
Chicago, May 23, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
*National Board of Trade, Produce Exchange Building,
New York City.*

DEAR SIR: Responding to yours of the 20th instant.

My belief is that immigration has been beneficial to the Missouri and the Mississippi valleys, promoting development of agricultural and other resources. In this large district, public lands open to settlement by citizens and those declaring their intention to become such, and lands formerly held by individuals and for sale at very cheap prices, where natural farming may be pursued (that is to say, without irrigation) have been largely taken up, but lands may still be procured by persons able to pay fair prices, and immigrants able to buy would apparently be useful in developing agricultural and animal industries.

In the semiarid districts farther west, where irrigation is necessary, lands may be had, including water rights, at varying prices, and it would appear that immigrants with adequate means might prosper and promote development in these districts.

The foregoing applies to immigrants with means adequate to their undertakings. Now, the settlement of large areas within the last few years by persons who have since become prosperous and independent, seems to have created a demand for farm help which competent and industrious laboring immigrants might supply with benefit to themselves and some profit to the country and its present land owning and farming occupants. At many times in the last few years, there has been a decided scarcity of good labor and at some periods it has been almost impossible to get labor at all, and it is probable that some important works have been greatly delayed and others may have been abandoned on this account, and industrial and commercial progress thereby retarded.

So, in my opinion, immigration of a wholesale kind has been beneficial in the past and is desirable now, both of persons of means and good industrious laborers for all kinds of work. I can not give any opinion as to the best method of directing immigrants with or without means through particular channels or to the localities needing them; or for putting them in the country and keeping them out of the already congested city districts.

This statement has been dictated without having had time or opportunity to do more, and it may be so general as to give no particular information. It covers merely my impression on the subject as to a large western district.

Yours, truly,

(Signed)

GEO. B. HARRIS,
President.

[Copy.]

No. 23.]

THE CHICAGO AND ALTON RAILROAD COMPANY,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Chicago, May 29, 1907.

Mr. J. J. D. TRENOR,

Produce Exchange Building, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I have your letter of May 20, asking for certain information in regard to immigration. In a general way, I would reply to your queries as follows:

1. Foreign immigration to the State of Illinois has been beneficial rather than otherwise.

2. There seems to be a shortage of labor, and as long as that continues we can afford to encourage immigration.

3. I do not believe the federal authorities could distribute immigration to any better advantage than the immigrants are able to distribute themselves. At the time the immigrant reaches our port he knows just where he is going and what he is going to do. He has his ticket, and I do not believe any federal regulation could induce the majority of them to change their minds as to their destination.

The lack of labor applies alike to the agricultural and industrial districts.

Yours, very truly,

(Signed)

S. M. FELTON

[Copy.]

No. 24.]

THE ATCHISON, TOPEKA AND,
SANTA FE RAILWAY SYSTEM,
PRESIDENT'S OFFICE, RAILWAY EXCHANGE,
9 Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, May 24, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,

Produce Exchange Building, New York City.

DEAR SIR: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 22 and in answer to your questions have to say:

First. I think the general influence of immigration to the West in recent years has been beneficial.

Second. Whether or not the tide of immigration has reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer depends upon the condition of business in this country in the future. Your question seems to limit inquiry to the State of Illinois, whereas I am speaking of conditions in the country through which our road passes and which covers 13 States and Territories. For the last three years and up to this time it has not been possible to obtain sufficient laborers either for our own work or for the agricultural communities along our line.

Third. I am certainly in favor of some plan of distribution of immigration if it is to continue in its present large amount. Immigrants are not, as a rule, wanted in the large seaport cities, but they have been badly wanted in the West and Southwest, probably also in the Northwest, although I am less familiar with that country. At the moment owing to the abandonment of a number of large enterprises and the hesitation about embarking capital in any enterprises, there seems to be plenty of labor for our purposes, but it is well known that it is difficult everywhere to obtain labor for the harvest and that domestic servants are still very scarce everywhere. It is also probably true that there are not enough coal miners in the country to supply the coal as wanted. Notwithstanding this there is still the serious question whether the enormous immigration of the past two years is desirable as a continuing matter, and whether a slight check in the development of this country might not result in a very unmanageable mass of unemployed and ignorant persons constituting a menace to the peace and safety of the country, and also it is a question, in my opinion, whether a little less speed in the development of the country might not be better borne than to risk the further admission of so large a mass of the ignorant, superstitious, and, perhaps, anarchistic, element of southern Europe.

Yours, truly,

(Signed)

E. P. RIPLEY.

[Copy.]

No. 25.]

ROCK ISLAND LINES,
BUREAU OF IMMIGRATION,
Chicago, May 25, 1907.

JOHN J. D. TRENOR, Esq.,

Produce Exchange Building, New York City.

DEAR SIR: Your esteemed favor of the 20th instant to our president, Mr. B. L. Winchell, has been referred to me for reply, and I take pleasure in answering herein your several queries.

First. Has the general influence of immigration to your State in recent years been beneficial or otherwise?

The Rock Island-Frisco System of Railways embraces a vast network of about 15,000 miles of track, spread over 16 States, to wit, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Arkansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama, all of them yet receptive, and most of them in absolute need of immigration for the further development of their agricultural, mineral, and industrial resources. The foreign element, especially of the agricultural population, in all of the States named constitutes the bone and sinew in most of the agricultural sections. Therefore, far from being a detriment, we consider the foreign immigration a benefit to our lines, and encourage it in every legitimate and lawful manner.

Second. In your opinion has the tide of immigration reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer?

The foreign immigration during the last fiscal year, ending June 30, 1906, had reached the highest figures on record, viz, 1,100,735. It was made up largely of the laboring classes, and yet wages have already risen, being now higher than ever before in the history of the country and the demand for laborers greater. It appears that the greater the supply of unskilled labor, the greater the activity in industrial plants and, consequently, the greater the demand for skilled laborers and mechanics at higher wages. The men who perform the hard manual labor, the drudgery, are generally the foreigners, the men from southern and southeastern Europe, who now constitute the bulk of our immigration, while the skilled labor is done by Americans, and the demand for his labor is greater with an ample supply of unskilled labor at hand, because the latter stimulates the industrial activity. Therefore I can not see how American laborers should be injured by immigration.

Third. Do you or do you not think that the fostering of an intelligent plan of distribution by the federal authorities in conjunction with those of the various States would, by relieving the congestion in our larger cities, tend to solve the problem of alleged excessive immigration?

Intelligent distribution according to the demand for immigration in the different sections and States is a most desirable measure for changing it from an apparent menace to an absolute benefit. The last annual report of the Federal Bureau of Immigration teaches that lesson by its comparative tables of the present distribution and by graphic charts. A rational distribution would take the wind out of the sails of the chronic opponents of immigration. At present

85 per cent of the total annual influx of aliens distributes itself over eastern States and cities, where it is neither needed nor wanted, while the States of the great South from the Atlantic coast to the Rio Grande are clamorous for it. I doubt, however, whether a system of distribution enforced by the Government would be the proper remedy, as it would most likely be too arbitrary and dictatorial. A campaign of education should be carried on in the home countries of the intending emigrant, such as has been inaugurated by the immigration department of the Rock Island-Frisco Lines, and is now being commenced by other railway companies and by several southern States. As much as possible of the annual influx should be diverted from New York to the Gulf coast and other southern ports, whence the immigrant can easily and more cheaply reach the sections of our country where he is welcome and where his best opportunities are waiting for him. The volume of immigration from Europe to America will always be governed by legislative enactments, unless such enactments are made prohibitive. When our demand for laborers is sufficiently supplied and our vacant lands settled up—when in Europe emigration has so far reduced the excess population that the demand for laborers there can no longer be easily supplied and higher wages prevail, then the emigration will naturally sink to a low numerical level.

Very respectfully, yours,

(Signed)

JNO. SEBASTIAN,
Passenger Traffic Manager.

[Copy.]

No. 26.]

ILLINOIS CENTRAL RAILROAD COMPANY,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Chicago, June 1, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,

Produce Exchange Building, New York City.

DEAR SIR: I have your favor of the 22d ultimo relative to the subject of immigration.

In reply to your first question, "Has the general influence of immigration to your State in recent years been beneficial or otherwise?" The Illinois Central system now reaches 13 States. Such of these States as are located north of the Ohio River have been greatly benefited by the coming of foreign families, who have aided especially in the industrial and agricultural development of each State. Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Alabama, the 5 States south of the Ohio River reached by the Illinois Central, afford great opportunities for foreigners, and yet comparatively few of them have located there. Such as have, which includes Germans, Hungarians, Scandinavians, and Italians, have all done well. Indeed, those that have settled in the Southern States mentioned in the past five years are pleased, contented, and prosperous.

Replying to question No. 2: I do not believe that immigration is in any way a menace to the interests of American laborers. The facts are that, throughout the country, there is a shortage of farm tenants and day laborers. That, and the further development of certain industries, will be greatly handicapped until more honest laborers, who are not afraid to work and who want to make homes

for themselves and families, can be found, no matter of what nationality. I am not in favor of restricting immigration of honest, able-bodied men, who I know could and would improve their own conditions and be a blessing to this country.

Replying to question No. 3: I do not believe there is an excess of immigration to the United States. On the contrary, in the southern territory in which this company is especially interested thousands of acres of as fine farm lands as can be found in this or any other section of the country will not be cultivated this season for want of laborers, and this is true of other sections of the United States. So long as such conditions obtain in the United States immigration can not be said to be excessive. It is quite possible that immigration is excessive in the cities of New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, but if the million and a quarter of foreigners coming to this country annually could be distributed throughout the South there is ample room for more families than now reside in those States. To my mind, what is especially needed is a concentrated and strong effort on the part of those who are interested in foreign immigration to have such families located, not in the cities, but in the country districts of the South, where are splendid opportunities for making themselves homes and help in the development of the country. The States of Mississippi and Louisiana have each about 20,000,000 acres of cultivable land, any 40 acres of which would make a nice farm for one of these foreign families, and on which they could not only make a living, but accumulate a fair competence for old age.

Yours, truly,

(Signed)

J. T. HARAHAN,
President.

[Copy.]

No. 27.]

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS,
STATE OF ILLINOIS,
May 21, 1907.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of the 13th instant, addressed to Governor Deneen, in which you inquire as to the influence of recent immigration to this State, has been referred to the writer with instructions to advise you that he is very much interested in the subject. Without attempting a detailed answer to your questions, I am quite satisfied that I express the governor's sentiments when I say that the influence of much of the immigration from foreign countries into Illinois in recent years has not been of a very desirable or beneficial character. Over 50 per cent of our foreign immigrants come from southern Europe, are of Slavic origin, and therefore represent a very low order of civilization. When it is considered that 25 per cent of the entire foreign immigration last year were unable to read or write, some idea of the material we have to deal with and the possible social and political problems which the immediate future will present can be obtained. This infusion of inferior blood threatens to affect the future life of our people, a consideration much more important than the present effects of their competition with the work and wages of our laboring classes, serious as that aspect of the case may be. The natural tendencies of the shiftless and vicious elements of foreign people is to settle in the large cities, and your suggestion of coopera-

tion between the State and National Government to the end that they might be distributed is a good one. A better plan would be to prevent a considerable number of certain nationalities from coming here at all. This result, it seems, could be reached through some necessary amendments to our immigration laws, excluding absolutely the illiterate and lawless elements, and providing for a higher and more rigid examination regarding the educational, physical, and property qualifications.

There is yet in Illinois a demand for the services, both in industrial and agricultural pursuits, of the right kind of foreigners. The class, who have no visible means of support, who may be induced to come here by a transportation company, who are strangers to our language and our laws, and who by their methods of life are unfitted to become good citizens, are not wanted.

I feel confident that the agitation, now daily increasing, concerning the subject of immigration will at an early day result in the formulation of needed rules and laws designed to prevent or minimize the evils resulting from the immigration of certain classes of people.

Very truly, yours,

(Signed)

DAVID ROSS,
Secretary.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
Produce Exchange Building, New York, N. Y.

[Copy.]

No. 28.]

EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Des Moines, Iowa, May 17, 1907.

MY DEAR SIR: I have your letter of the 13th instant. My information with respect to the problem of immigration is only such information as an ordinary observer acquires, and my conclusions, therefore, can be of little value to one who has given the subject long and careful study. Iowa is peculiarly situated with reference to the matter, inasmuch as our dominant interest is agriculture, and the State has comparatively few citizens or residents of foreign birth, save those who live or work on farms.

Your first question is, "Has the general influence of immigration to your State in recent years been beneficial or otherwise?" I answer without hesitation that it has been clearly beneficial. In recent years we have, of course, received some undesirable accessions to our population, but not enough to affect the general moral level of the State.

I prefer not to attempt an answer to your second question, for the reason that while I have decided views upon it, I feel that my investigation has not been sufficient to warrant an opinion that may be used as a guide for others.

For a like reason I feel that I can be of no help to you with regard to your question No. 3.

Regretting that I am not able to be of more service to you in this matter, I am,

Very truly, yours,

(Signed)

ALBERT B. CUMMINS.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
*Produce Exchange Building,
New York, N. Y.*

[Copy.]

No. 29.]

STATE OF KANSAS,
Topeka, May 17, 1907.

MY DEAR SIR: I am overwhelmed with things to do and can not answer your questions at length, but will say in general that Kansas has been benefited and not injured by the immigration of the past. Our immigration has been, generally, home seekers of the best nationalities. If labor in this State has felt any adverse effect it is not apparent, for it is almost impossible to get men to do the necessary work and they absolutely control wages.

Very truly, yours,

(Signed)

E. W. HOCH,
Governor.

To JOHN J. D. TRENOR,

Produce Exchange Building, New York.

[Copy.]

No. 30.]

THE COMMERCIAL CLUB OF TOPEKA,
Topeka, Kans., May 25, 1907.

JOHN J. D. TRENOR,

Produce Exchange Building, New York.

DEAR SIR: Yours of the 16th instant to the president of the Chamber of Commerce. The Commercial Club is the business organization of the city, and I answer your questions regarding immigration in the order in which presented.

1. Decidedly beneficial.

2. Immigration has not reached the point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer, at least so far as the State of Kansas is concerned.

3. I think that the fostering of an intelligent plan of distribution by the authorities, in conjunction with those of the various cities, is a solution to the problem of excessive immigration. There is plenty of labor of all kinds in the West, and it ought to be sent to these localities instead of allowed to congregate in the larger cities. To illustrate: A number of years ago a sect known as the Mennonites came to Kansas from Russia on account of religious and political troubles. Many of our people thought they were undesirable but they have proved to be among the very best citizens of this State, frugal, industrious people. They have opened up extensive farms, established banks, and engaged in manufacturing. Most any class of European immigration placed in the West outside of the larger cities will make desirable citizens. Many Russian immigrants have located in this city and many of them work in the Santa Fe railway shops. They make not only good day laborers, but in many cases, good skilled mechanics.

Very truly, yours,

(Signed)

T. J. ANDERSON,
Secretary.

[Copy.]

No. 31.]

SENATE CHAMBER,
Maysville, Ky., May 22, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR.

MY DEAR SIR: I acknowledge the receipt of your valuable letter of the 17th, and hasten to reply as far as I am able to do so from a limited amount of information.

First. As to the general influence of immigration to our State.

It has been of some benefit, but the limited numbers that have come makes it hard to form an estimate. Undoubtedly, the benefit in some sections has been great. If we could outlive the unsavory reputation our people have for high tempers and disposition to fly to arms it would attract immigration. I hope the day is not far distant.

Second. I am firmly of the opinion that immigration has been a menace to labor. The cure is hard to accomplish, but the relief might be effected by stringent laws requiring certain educational and property qualifications, as well as a greater regard for the laws of our country; also to disabuse the mind that this is a country wallowing in wealth, and that while free, everyone is the builder of his own fortune.

Third. As to an intelligent plan of distribution by federal authorities in conjunction with the States.

Undoubtedly, this would tend to curtail excessive immigration and bring the parties together for work as well as improvement. At this time our agricultural districts are badly in need of help, and good, willing workers are in demand and can command good wages. The industrial sources are not so badly off, owing to the fact that we are an agricultural State, but in the larger cities manufacturing industries are on the increase and competent help is needed.

Trusting that I have answered your questions in an intelligent manner, and that they may be of some service to you, I am,

Yours, very truly,

(Signed) WILLIAM H. COX.

[Copy.]

No. 32.]

LOUISIANA STATE BOARD OF
AGRICULTURE AND IMMIGRATION,
New Orleans, La., May 20, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,

Produce Exchange Building, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Your letter without date, addressed to Hon. Newton C. Blanchard, governor of the State of Louisiana, has been referred to me to reply.

In answer to your first question, I beg to state that the general influence of immigration in Louisiana in recent years has been very beneficial.

Second. So far, foreign immigration has been limited, and has not proved a menace to the interest of American labor.

Third. I agree with your proposition. I believe intelligent distribution by the federal authorities in conjunction with those of various States would undoubtedly relieve the congestion of larger cities and solve the problem of excessive immigration.

Fourth. Immigration is needed in the State of Louisiana principally to develop its agricultural resources. We have comparatively no manufactories except in the city of New Orleans, and there has never been any demand by these manufactories for immigrants.

In the State of Louisiana there are 26,000,000 acres of land susceptible to agricultural development, and only about 25 per cent of that number is under cultivation, and labor is scarce to even cultivate that amount.

I leave for Europe this evening in search of immigrants, mainly to develop the agricultural resources of the State of Louisiana.

Hoping this meager reply will be of advantage to you in your search for information, I am,

Respectfully,

(Signed)

CHAS. SCHULER,
Commissioner.

[Copy.]

No. 33.]

BUREAU OF INDUSTRIAL AND
LABOR STATISTICS, STATE OF MAINE,
Augusta, May 27, 1907.

MR. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,

Produce Exchange Building, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Yours of recent date to our governor, William T. Cobb, in relation to the influence of immigration, has been handed me for reply.

In reply to question 1: I will say that the influence of immigration in our State has been beneficial as far as developing our material resources is concerned; in fact without foreign labor many of our large industries would decline very materially, and the installation of new industries would be prevented or very much retarded. In the construction of railroads and large pulp and paper plants we use almost wholly Italian labor, and our cotton-mill crews are very largely made up of French Canadians, the French becoming permanent residents, but most of the Italians are transient. As a rule our immigrants make very desirable citizens, although there are exceptions, but it would be in a very small percentage of cases where we might say their influence was harmful.

To question 2: I would say that we hardly feel the influence of the foreigner as a menace to American labor. There may be a few isolated cases where foreign labor has taken the place of American labor at a lower rate of wages, but such conditions soon pass away, for it does not take long to absorb and Americanize what foreigners come to our State. We have about 93,000 foreign-born population in Maine; all except 5,000 are from Canada (a majority of English descent), Great Britain, Norway, Sweden, and Germany.

Your third question I should answer in the affirmative. I think the need of agricultural laborers in Maine is more pressing than in the manufacturing industries.

Very truly, yours,

(Signed)

THOS. J. LYONS,
Commissioner.

[Copy.]

No. 34.]

SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
CARDINAL'S RESIDENCE,
408 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md., June 7, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR.

DEAR SIR: In answer to your favor of the 4th instant, the cardinal desires me to send you the following replies:

To your first question he would answer, yes; to your second, no. In regard to the third question he thinks it would be well to distribute the flood of immigration more generally, but doubts if it can be done, as every immigrant is free to go where he pleases.

The cry of the farmers for more help, the complaint of manufacturers and merchants that they can not get the necessary help, seems to be an answer to your last question.

Hoping that this answer will be satisfactory, I am

Yours, truly,

W. T. RUSSELL,
Secretary.

[Copy.]

No. 35.]

MAINE CENTRAL RAILROAD COMPANY,
PRESIDENT'S OFFICE,
Boston, Mass., May 25, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,

Produce Exchange Building, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your circular letter, which was received on the 24th instant:

Speaking generally for all of the New England States—with the commercial conditions of which I have been familiar during the greater portion of my life—it is not my opinion that the general influence of immigration upon them during recent years has been otherwise than beneficial, and I have discovered nothing that leads me to suppose that the tide of immigration has reached a point where it is a menace to the interests of American labor in any of these States.

From their point of view, I know of nothing that can be done by the federal authorities in conjunction with the several New England state governments that is necessary to relieve the congestion in our larger cities, or to solve the problem of alleged excessive immigration to these States. The agricultural question in New England is, as you undoubtedly know, no longer paramount, but the demand for factory labor of various kinds is constantly increasing, and there is yet no indication that the supply of this labor through immigration has reached the point where it is introducing any troublesome problems.

I fully understand that industrial conditions in the New England States are quite different from those existing in the South and West, and that, therefore, a consideration of this question from our point of view can not be made a standard for dealing with it under con-

ditions that undoubtedly exist in other and less densely populated States, and particularly in those where agriculture is the preponderating industry.

Yours, truly,

(Signed)

LUCIUS TUTTLE,
President.

[Copy.]

No. 36.]

BOSTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
May 20, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,

Produce Exchange Building, New York City.

DEAR SIR: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 16th instant, and am pleased to give you what information I can on the lines of your inquiry.

In reply to your first question, I feel that it is the consensus of public opinion that immigration in our State in recent years has been beneficial. It is hard to see how we could have gotten along without it, as there is a shortage of help in many lines that could not have been supplied in any other way than by immigration, and in some lines there is still need of a good deal more help.

Our bureau of labor and statistics at present are engaged in a canvass of Massachusetts and New England to determine just how great this need is, and in what lines of industry. Some publication on this subject is likely to be issued within the next thirty days, and I shall be pleased to supply you with it when the issue is made.

My answer to the first question perhaps answers the second—that, so far as our State is concerned, the tide of immigration has not reached a point as yet where it constitutes a menace to the interests of American labor.

The figures for 1906 show that 47 per cent of the immigrants into Boston remain within the State.

We here are rather doubtful of the success of any attempt on the part of the federal authorities to relieve the congestion in our larger cities by any plan which calls upon immigrants when located in the cities to leave and go into the country. Apparently the majority of the immigrants prefer to remain in the cities, either large or small, to going into the country. If they are ticketed from home to country districts, they will go there, but if they once go into the cities it is said to be very hard to induce them to leave.

I am told that there is a need of more help in the agricultural districts of our State, but that it is very hard to supply it by immigration.

I am sending you under separate cover some publications of our bureau of statistics of labor for Massachusetts, which I think you may find of some interest to you in connection with your undertaking.

Yours, very truly,

(Signed)

JOHN F. CROCKER,
President.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, CITY OF HOLYOKE, MASS.

In answer to my letter of May 23, 1907, the Hon. Nathan P. Avery, mayor of the city of Holyoke, Mass., replied as follows:

Question 1. Has the general influence of immigration in recent years to your State been beneficial or otherwise?

Answer. Beneficial.

Question 2. In your opinion has the tide of immigration reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer?

Answer. No.

Question 3. Do you, or do you not, think that the fostering of an intelligent plan of distribution by the federal authorities in conjunction with those of the various States would, by relieving the congestion in the larger cities, tend to solve the problem of alleged excessive immigration?

Answer. Yes.

Question 4. If in your opinion immigration is needed in your State, is it required for the development of your agricultural as well as your industrial resources?

Answer. Both.

[Copy.]

No. 38.]

DETROIT BOARD OF COMMERCE,
May 24, 1907.

MR. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
Produce Exchange Building, New York City.

DEAR SIR: The manufactures committee of this board gave considerable attention last summer to the relations of immigration to the labor market. Some of its conclusions apply to the queries which you recently addressed to the president of the board.

1. The general influence of immigration to the State in recent years has been beneficial. There has been one drawback in Detroit, and to a less extent in one or two other cities; the immigration has produced unwholesome housing conditions. But neither the mining operations in the northern part of the State nor the manufacturing operations and the municipal improvements of the cities could have been conducted without the large immigration. The bad housing conditions we hope to remedy.

2. The industrial demands of the country have been so great the past three years that we have been able to absorb the immense immigration without reducing the wages of the American laborer or depriving him of work.

In this city, and presumably in other cities of like class, the tendency of wages has been upward. But it appears as if we had about reached the limit. If a period of depression should follow the foreign mass would undoubtedly reduce the standard. It is impossible in short space to discuss the various methods of restriction that were proposed in congressional bills and that have been suggested to the Immigration Bureau. More effective measures on the other side to check assisted immigration would seem to be one feasible method.

3. An intelligent plan of distribution would undoubtedly be exceedingly beneficial. This board, the Michigan Manufacturers' Association, and other organizations would gladly cooperate with the Government in carrying out such a plan.

4. If properly distributed, this State could take considerable immigration in the agricultural districts, but the manufacturing centers can absorb the most.

If your investigations lead to definite results we shall be pleased to receive copies of the report.

Respectfully,

(Signed)

WM. STOCKING,
Committee Secretary.

[Copy.]

No. 39.]

GRAND RAPIDS BOARD OF TRADE,
May 31, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,

Produce Exchange Building, New York City, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Answering your favor of the 23d instant, permit me to reply as follows:

1. During recent years the State of Michigan has not been influenced, either favorably or otherwise, to an extent sufficient to arrest public notice.

2. In my opinion the tide of immigration at present in evidence does not constitute a menace to the interests of the American laborer.

3. Cooperative distribution of immigrants, conducted with equal fairness to all sections of the country and without the development of graft and favoritism, may be possible, but I know of no plan yet formulated by which such a result can be achieved. Could such a plan be evolved and successfully administered there can be no question as to its value not only to the larger cities, but to the lesser ones and all of our urban and agricultural district.

4. Immigration is needed in Michigan, and particularly in the western half of our Commonwealth. Moreover, the Grand Rapids Board of Trade has the matter in hand locally, and hopes to be able to show results during the next year.

Very truly, yours,

(Signed)

H. D. C. VAN ASMUS,
Secretary.

[Copy.]

No. 40.] DULUTH, SOUTH SHORE AND ATLANTIC RY CO ,
MINERAL RANGE RAILROAD CO.,
Marquette, Mich., May 27, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,

Produce Exchange Building, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of May 20, asking information in connection with immigration to this section of the country, received. I am inclosing you herewith an expression from Mr. E. W. MacPherran, our land commissioner.

Yours, truly,

(Signed)

W. F. FITCH,
President and General Manager.

Mr. W. F. FITCH,
President and General Manager.

DEAR SIR: Referring to letter herewith from Mr. John J. D. Trenor, a member of the National Board of Trade and Commission on Immigration of New York City, I would say relative to the questions proposed by him:

First. The general influence of immigration on the Upper Peninsula of Michigan has been distinctly beneficial rather than otherwise.

Second. I do not believe the tide of immigration has reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer in northern Michigan.

Third. I am emphatically of the opinion that the fostering of the plan of the distribution by the federal authorities acting with the State authorities might tend to solve the problem of the alleged excessive immigration, but am of the opinion that the alleged excessive immigration is such only by reason of the very large proportion of undesirable citizens immigrating; and that if proper restrictions were made and observed by the federal authorities the quality of the immigrant would be and could be improved.

Immigration is needed in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan for the development of the agricultural interests and mining resources, but whether this immigration might better be from foreign countries or not, is a question which is quite open to discussion.

Yours, very truly,

(Signed)

E. W. MACPHERRAN,
Land Commissioner.

[Copy.]

No. 41.]

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
 EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
St. Paul, May 17, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
Produce Exchange Building, New York City.

DEAR SIR: Permit me to acknowledge your favor of May 13, in which you submit a number of questions touching immigration and ask that I reply to the same.

As to question No. 1, I should say that immigration to this State in recent years has been very beneficial. The immigrants to this State have come almost entirely from the northern countries of Europe, and thousands of them have become well-to-do farmers, stock raisers, dairymen, and the like. Comparatively few have settled permanently in the larger cities of this State. In my opinion the tide of immigration has reached a point where it may constitute a menace to the interests of the American laborer should there be no restriction in the tide of cheap labor from western European countries.

I certainly agree to the proposition that an intelligent distribution under federal authority would relieve the congestion in our larger cities, and possibly also provide a means of supplying the labor

market in those parts of the country in which at various seasons of the year there is a real shortage of labor.

Trusting that this fragmentary discussion may be of service to you, I am,

Very truly, yours,

(Signed)

JOHN F. JOHNSON,
Governor.

[Copy.]

No. 42.]

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
City of Minneapolis, Minn., May 28, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,

Produce Exchange, New York City.

DEAR SIR: Your favor of the 23d instant, on behalf of the president of the National Board of Trade and its committee on immigration seeking information as to the effect of immigration into our State, etc., was duly received. In reply I beg to state that in view of the fact that I have not made any special study of this subject and your questions seem to refer to conditions throughout the State, I shall take the liberty to refer your communication to the state labor bureau at St. Paul, whose province it is to make a special study of the conditions which your queries evidently contemplate.

I will state in a general way that there has never been any pronounced sentiment against immigration in this State, provided the objectionable classes are kept out. This, of course, includes the diseased, the incompetent and criminal classes. There is at present, however, a decided scarcity of common labor both in the agricultural and industrial departments of this State and I believe this is substantially true throughout the entire territory west of the Mississippi River.

Very truly, yours,

(Signed)

J. C. HAYNES, *Mayor.*

[Copy.]

No. 43.]

THE PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
OF THE COMMERCIAL CLUB,
Minneapolis, May 21, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,

New York City, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of May 16 to the chamber of commerce of this city has been turned over to this organization, as our chamber is not a public body.

The questions you ask were considered by the executive committee of our club, and I was directed to advise you that in the opinion of its members, the influence of immigration to Minnesota in recent years has been beneficial. The members were also of the opinion that so far as this locality is concerned, immigration has not reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of our laborers. The committee also expressed the opinion that so far as this State

is concerned, further immigration is desirable for the development of both its agricultural and its industrial resources.

Regarding the suggestion of a plan by which immigrants could be distributed so as to relieve the congestion in cities and sent to districts where they are necessary, our committee did not feel sufficiently conversant with the matter to offer suggestions, and I was directed to ask you to furnish us, if you cared to do so, a more definite outline of such a plan.

Yours, very truly,

(Signed) W. G. NYE.

[Copy.]

No. 44.]

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
BUREAU OF LABOR,
St. Paul, June 6, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
Produce Exchange Building, New York City.

DEAR SIR: Yours of the 23d ultimo in relation to the matter of immigration, addressed to Hon. J. C. Haynes, has been referred to this office for answer. Probably the influence of foreign immigration is less felt in this section than it is in the more densely populated sections of the East. In Minnesota we gladly welcome all intelligent foreign immigrants. Replying to your questions categorically:

1. The general influence of immigration in this State in recent years has been beneficial. As a matter of fact I believe that we get the cream of the foreign invasion, a large percentage being Scandinavian, German, with a sprinkling of Finns, all of whom make good citizens.

2. In this State immigration has not reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer. In the large cities of Minnesota common labor to-day is receiving from \$1.75 per day up, and it is hard to supply the demand.

3. We favor the fostering of an intelligent plan of distribution by the federal authorities; or, in other words, we are in favor of some plan which will give the agricultural States more of the really desirable element. I do not feel that at any time the United States should permit ignorant or criminal immigration. In this State immigration is needed, both for agricultural and industrial resources.

Yours, very truly

(Signed) E. J. LYNCH,
Assistant Commissioner of Labor.

[Copy.]

No. 45.]

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY,
PRESIDENT'S OFFICE,
St. Paul, Minn., May 20, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,

Produce Exchange Building, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Your favor of the 15th instant, making certain inquiries concerning immigration and labor, duly received, and I take pleasure in sending you the following information:

The general influence in the past upon Minnesota and the Northwest has been beneficial. At the time of the last census the percentage of foreign-born population in North Dakota was 35.4, the highest in the United States. In Minnesota it was 28.9, in Montana 27.6, and in Washington 21.5. To immigrants, therefore, in large degree, this section owes its development.

Immigration can not threaten seriously the interests of American labor as long as there is a continuous and active demand for labor, at high prices, which remains unsatisfied. The labor famine is general throughout the Northwest. It affects agriculture, mining, railroad building, and every other form of industry.

The earlier settlers in Minnesota who are now getting too old to cultivate their lands themselves are selling their farms. By the consolidation of these large farms are forming containing several hundred acres each, to be cultivated by machinery which can not be used to advantage on 160 acres. In northern Minnesota and in North Dakota many of these large farms may be found as a product of labor scarcity.

The children of the farmer are mostly ambitious to get an education, with the idea that it will enable them to live without actual work.

All occupations suffer from the scarcity of manual labor. The Government has to pay as high as \$2.50 to \$3 per day for men to work on its reclamation projects. Railroads can not get men for new construction necessary to the prompt transaction of the country's business. Owners of coal mines can not find men to work them. There was a coal famine in Seattle last winter, although the coal mines are but a few miles away.

The coal production in Montana of 1905 was 1,467,707 tons against 1,483,728 tons in 1900, while the total coal production of the country increased more than a hundred million tons. Washington's coal product in 1905 was 15 per cent greater than in 1900, and had decreased in each of the two preceding years.

More manual labor is needed all over the country, and especially in the Northwest. The demand comes not only from the workshop but from the farm, the mine, and from every branch of industry. Any plan of distribution that would divert immigrants from the congested districts to those where labor is scarce and high would be beneficial.

Yours very truly,

(Signed)

JAS. J. HILL.

[Copy.]

No. 46.] CHICAGO GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY CO.,
OFFICE OF PRESIDENT,
St. Paul, Minn., May 22, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
Produce Exchange Building, New York City, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I have only time to make a hasty reply to your letter of May 20.

When I first commenced railway construction, thirty-odd years ago, the Irishman did the heavy, hard work of shoveling. As time went on the Irishman settled down on farms and refused to do this hard work, and the Swedes and Norwegians came in and took the place of the Irishmen. Now the Swedes have got farms and the only men available for the hard work are the Italians.

During this period of evolution a great deal of machinery, like the steam shovel, has been introduced, which does a large part of the shoveling; but still there is some shoveling and kindred work which must be done by men, and if the Government is going to shut out of the country all the Italians, as well as the Chinese and Japanese, who are willing to do this work, not only the construction of new railways, but the maintenance of such railroads as exist, will become impossible. It is not a question of wages. The Italians demand as much wages, or more, than was ever paid to the Irishmen or the Swedes.

Yours, truly, (Signed) A. B. STICKNEY,
President.

[Copy.]

No. 47.] MINNEAPOLIS, ST. PAUL AND
SAULT STE. MARIE RAILWAY COMPANY,
May 27, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
Produce Exchange Building, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Referring to yours of the 22d in regard to immigration to this country.

In my opinion much immigration is yet needed, if of the desirable kind, to settle up our States, Minnesota, Dakota, and Wisconsin, and every effort possible should be made to keep them out of the cities. Put them into the country, where land is cheap, where they can become better citizens and be of more use to this country.

We have too many immigrants that stay in the city; they are only a detriment. We can receive many good foreigners in this country yet without any detriment to the labor market.

Yours, truly, (Signed) E. PENNINGTON,
Vice-President and General Manager.

No. 48.]

STATE OF MISSOURI.

In answer to my letter of May 13, 1907, the Hon. Joseph W. Folk, governor of the State of Missouri, through the bureau of labor statistics, replied as follows:

Question 1. Has the general influence of immigration to your State in recent years been beneficial or otherwise?

Answer. It has, in Missouri, been rather beneficial than otherwise.

Question 2. In your opinion has the tide of immigration reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer? If so, what method of restriction would you suggest?

Answer. Foreign immigration has not yet by any means become a menace to American labor in Missouri. I can not speak for the other States.

Question 3. Do you, or do you not, think that the fostering of an intelligent plan of distribution by the federal authorities in conjunction with those of the various States would, by relieving the congestion in our larger cities, tend to solve the problem of alleged excessive immigration?

Answer. Yes; unquestionably, the plan is a good one.

Question 4. If in your opinion immigration is needed in your State, is it required for the development of your agricultural as well as your industrial resources?

Answer. It is needed chiefly for the development of the fruit and dairy interests of the Ozark region.

[Copy.]

No. 49.]

OFFICE OF MAYOR,
Kansas City, Mo., June 5, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,

Produce Exchange Building, New York City.

MY DEAR SIR: I have your letter of May 23. Kansas City has not been very much affected by immigration. I am not familiar throughout the State along this line. I do not believe I could answer your questions in such way as to aid you in getting at the conclusions which you wish to reach.

Our own city, with whose conditions I am thoroughly familiar, is not yet a great manufacturing city. We sometimes regret that in talking among ourselves. There has not yet been any large immigration into the city. I can not believe that as a city, we feel the immigration or feel the need of it at this time. As I have said, my knowledge of conditions throughout the State, is not such as to put me in a position to give you answers which might be relied upon as of any great value.

Very truly, yours,

(Signed)

H. M. BEARDSLEY, *Mayor.*

No. 50.]

STATE OF NEBRASKA.

In answer to my letter of May 13, 1907, the Hon. George L. Sheldon, governor of the State of Nebraska, replied as follows:

Question 1. Has the general influence of immigration to your State in recent years been beneficial or otherwise?

Answer. Beneficial.

Question 2. In your opinion, has the tide of immigration reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer?

Answer. No.

Question 3. Do you, or do you not, think that the fostering of an intelligent plan of distribution by the federal authorities, in conjunction with those of the various States, would, by relieving the congestion in our larger cities, tend to solve the problem of alleged excessive immigration?

Answer. Yes.

Question 4. If, in your opinion, immigration is needed in your State, is it required for the development of your agricultural as well as your industrial resources?

Answer. Laboring men.

[Copy.]

No. 51.]

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
May 15, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
Produce Exchange Building, New York City.

MY DEAR SIR: I have your favor of May 13, propounding various questions on the matter of immigration. I do not feel that I can answer these questions categorically yes or no and yet be true to the exact situation. I therefore answer them generally.

Under present conditions the demand for labor in the various fields of activity is so great that it can not be supplied by our own people alone and desirable immigration seems to be necessary to aid in the natural development of our resources and industries. We have in the southern part of our State several Jewish and Italian colonies that have been very successful in agricultural development and have made excellent citizens. At Woodbine there is an agricultural college aided by Baron de Hirsch, which is doing most excellent work in theoretical, experimental, and practical agriculture.

Foreign immigration brings troubles in its wake. Our courts and our prisons are unfortunate witnesses to the truth of this statement. It is probable, however, that this unfortunate feature of our immigration is due to the lack of knowledge on the part of our immigrants of our laws and institutions and to the fact that they are not properly looked after by state and municipal authorities. They are very apt to fall into the hands of sharps, who regard these newcomers as their legitimate prey. In view of this situation New Jersey has taken a step which, we think, will greatly remedy the ills of immigration and will set the pace for other States to follow.

In 1906 the legislature adopted a concurrent resolution authorizing the governor to appoint a commission of three persons, residents of the State, to inquire into and report upon the general condition of the immigrants coming into or resident within the State. That commission reported that foreigners coming to this country were absolutely dependent upon each other to obtain a knowledge of the

conditions surrounding their lives in the home of their adoption; that there was no way for the foreigner to learn the laws of this country, his rights and privileges or his duties as a citizen until he could speak English. Many of them learned the laws by breaking them.

To remedy this unfortunate condition the State has appropriated \$10,000 to begin the work of educating the immigrant. Pamphlets on the history and principles of the United States and the state government will be printed in English and every such foreign language as may be necessary to reach the foreign element. Night schools will also be established in different centers throughout the State for the study of the English language and civil government.

This is but a beginning, and it is hoped that the results will prove so beneficial as to warrant the establishment of a permanent policy for the enlightenment of the foreign population.

Very sincerely, yours,

(Signed)

E. C. STOKES.

[Copy.]

No. 52.]

EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Newark, N. J., May 24, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,

Produce Exchange Building, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your letter of the 23d instant, I beg to say:

1. I believe that the general influence of immigration to our State in recent years has been beneficial, viewed in the larger sense. Not only have we secured a great many industrious and saving mechanics and tradesmen, but we have been able to undertake enterprises and engage in development work on a scale that would not have been possible without the aid of our foreign-born citizens. Furthermore, I find that the great majority of the immigrants are readily susceptible to the influence of American institutions, and that the second generation particularly presents a fine body of citizenship.

2. I do not think immigration has reached such a point that it has become a menace to the interests of American labor. In New Jersey, despite a large foreign-born population, we are in constant need of day laborers, American-born and even immigrants who have been here for some time generally ascending in the scale of life. There is also an acute demand for women for domestic service, which could not be even in a measure supplied were it not for the constant tide of immigration. As it is, many of our factories employ female help to a large extent and draw not only from the centers of population in the cities, but also from the suburban and rural districts, and even from the landing places of the immigrants.

I would, however, be in favor of adopting rigid methods to restrict the immigration of all who are of criminal tendency or who are likely to become public charges upon the community.

3. I believe that the fostering of an intelligent plan of distribution by the federal authorities in conjunction with those of the various States would tend largely to solve the problem by relieving the congestion in such cities as suffer from that condition.

So far as I am able to observe I am of the opinion that the farmers of New Jersey must depend in large measure upon immigrants for aid

in their operations. There is, I have reason to believe, a very great scarcity of farm laborers in all the agricultural sections of the State, due to the fact that our industrial development has proceeded so rapidly as to strip the agricultural regions of able-bodied men.

Yours, very truly,

(Signed)

JACOB HAUSSLING, *Mayor*.

[Copy.]

No. 53.]

THE BOARD OF TRADE OF THE
CITY OF NEWARK, N. J.,
May 20, 1907.

JOHN J. D. TRENOR, Esq.,

Produce Exchange Building, New York.

DEAR SIR: Acknowledging the receipt of yours under date of May 16 with reference to the question of immigration, would respectfully report that the whole subject is one of vital importance and worthy the attention which I note is being paid to it by the National Congress, who have appointed a committee of its members to make a thorough investigation of the subject. The said committee, I believe, are about to leave for Europe, where they will study the matter at short range.

Answering your questions in part, would say:

First. Immigration has been very welcome to this State, and to this city particularly, where our manufacturing interests are creating constant demands for help.

Second. A desirable class of emigrants from middle Europe for laboring uses should be invited.

Third. It seems to me that the immigrant is better assimilated in our cities than would be the case if located in rural sections throughout the various States.

The children of the Italian immigrants of twenty years ago are good American citizens to-day, as is the case with the children of German, Irish, Scotch, and other nationalities.

Hoping this may be of some little help to you, I beg to remain, on behalf of the board,

(Signed)

JAS. M. REILLY.

[Copy.]

No. 54.]

MAYOR'S OFFICE,
Trenton, May 24, 1907.

JOHN J. D. TRENOR, Esq.,

Produce Exchange Building, New York City.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your letter of May 23, 1907, I would say that I am not prepared to speak as to the general influence of immigration to our State; as to the influence on our city, it has been very beneficial. We have a class here that is industrious and thrifty, and many of them are becoming owners of property.

As to the balance of your letter, I most frankly say that I have not given much thought and do not know that I could help you. In a

general way I have always felt that every able-bodied man with good physical and moral health who comes to us from the foreign lands is a benefit to this country.

Yours very truly,

(Signed)

F. W. GNICHTEL, *Mayor.*

[Copy.]

No. 55.]

ALBANY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
95 STATE STREET,
Albany, N. Y., May 20, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your favor of the 16th instant, asking certain questions regarding the immigration problem. In reply to the same let me say that we are hardly in a position to answer your questions. We believe, however, that the immigration to our State has been beneficial, and we hardly feel with the present prosperous times that this immigration has reached a point where it is a menace to the interests of the American laborer.

We believe that the question of distribution should be very carefully considered, as from the small amount of study which we have given the question we believe that a large portion of these immigrants stop in the cities where they are not needed.

Our state department of agriculture at the present time is endeavoring to persuade some of the men who come into our country to come to Albany, and by them to be sent into the farming communities in this vicinity needing help. This is in an experimental stage, consequently there is not much information of value to be had on the subject.

I wish that I could be more explicit in my answers.

Yours, very truly,

(Signed)

WILLIAM B. JONES,
Secretary.

[Copy.]

No. 56.]

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
CITY OF BINGHAMTON,
June 3, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
Produce Exchange Building, New York City.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your favor of recent date covering the question of immigration, would state that my opportunities for studying this question have been very limited, Binghamton being an inland city of not over 50,000 inhabitants, possessing a large rural district from which to obtain its workmen, and therefore does not face the same social and industrial conditions found in the large coast cities.

In answer to question 1, would say that up to the present time immigration to this State has been beneficial, and it has been necessary in order to carry out the vast enterprises entered into by indus-

trial promoters. At the present time, however, there is some question in the minds of many as to whether a check should not be placed upon the constantly increasing flow of immigration from southern Europe. When the great improvements now under way are completed thousands of immigrants will drift back into the cities disqualified to take up any class of work higher than that of a laborer, and then the State will face the problem of caring for them.

Replying to question 3, would say that in my opinion immigration will not aid in developing the agricultural industry inasmuch as the work on our farms is hard to perform and necessitates long hours, and it is not the kind of work that appeals to the class of immigrants being received in this country at the present time.

With regret that I am unable to more intelligently discuss the questions referred to, I am,

Very truly, yours,

(Signed)

H. H. WOODBURY, *Mayor*.

[Copy.]

No. 57.]

MAYOR'S OFFICE,
Elmira, N. Y., May 28, 1907.

JOHN J. D. TRENOR, Esq.,

Produce Exchange Building, New York City.

DEAR SIR: Replying to yours 23d. I have no detailed statistical information, the result of scientific inquiry as to the effect in the State of New York of foreign immigration the past few years. I have, however, a general impression which is, that up to a given volume of immigration the introduction of foreigners has been serviceable to the State. Of course, there are evils connected with it, particularly in the city of New York, and the great question is to properly distribute the immigrants. The truth is, Americans will not work at agricultural and laboring work, and internal improvements as well as the product of agriculture must depend more or less upon laborers that come to us from abroad.

I am of opinion that the tide of immigration has reached a point where it should be somewhat regulated. It does not, so far as I know, constitute a menace to the interests of the American laborer because America does not, as is stated in the answer to the first question above, supply any considerable number of common laborers.

As to skilled labor, the proposition may have a different appearance. The stubbornest fact we have to face now-a-days is the one of skilled mechanics. If the introduction of such by immigration could be prohibited, a temporary industrial damage might result, but possibly the educational authorities or those in control of the common-school system of the country might have their eyes opened to the truth that the true system of education is the preparation of pupils for the particular industrial career they are likely to or ought to follow.

I am not sufficiently familiar with the details of the regulation of immigration to suggest measures, but if it could be amicably arranged, our own inspection and regulation at the foreign ports of embarkation would seem to be a good measure, and, in addition, the inspection of the immigrants on their arrival, as is now done. Any immigrant likely to be self-supporting by legitimate industry should be admitted.

The question of distribution of immigrants and others who congest the great cities is a very serious and intricate one. A conjunction of state and federal authorities in devising and executing an intelligent plan of exclusion might facilitate it, but humanity is gregarious, the immigrants have lived in congested districts abroad very largely, and it will be, I apprehend, a very difficult matter to get them upon the land and into suburban regions. It is a matter of the greatest importance and of utmost intricacy. I am not competent to advise about it.

Respectfully,

(Signed)

Z. R. BROCKWAY,
Mayor.

[Copy.]

No. 58.]

DELAWARE, LACKAWANNA AND
WESTERN RAILROAD COMPANY,
Office of the President, May 21, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
Produce Exchange, New York City.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of the 20th received and I note your inquiries. I will reply to them categorically, as made.

1. I consider that the general influence of immigration in recent years to the several States through which our line runs has been highly beneficial.

2. I do not consider that the tide of immigration has reached the point as yet where it constitutes in a measure a menace to the interests of the American laborer, so called. I do not consider that conditions are such as to require that any restrictions shall be placed upon the immigration into this country of healthy, able-bodied, intelligent foreigners coming from any of the European countries.

3. I think in many ways it would be a very great advantage to the country at large and to the cities in particular should the General Government formulate an intelligent plan of distribution of immigrants coming into the country, and carry out same on lines that are feasible and will tend to relieve the congestion which exists more or less in the larger cities in the country.

So far as the States through which our line runs are concerned, immigration is not, in my opinion, required for the development of the agricultural resources of these States as much as to carry on the operation of the industries thereof.

Referring to the postscript to your letter, I consider that the effect of immigration on the general development of the commercial and industrial resources of the States and communities through which our system is located has been very great and highly beneficial to those interests and has been of the utmost advantage to the development of our country at large.

Very respectfully, yours,

(Signed)

W. H. TRUESDALE,
President.

[Copy.]

No. 59.]

GREENWICH SAVINGS BANK,
246 AND 248 SIXTH AVENUE,
SE. CORNER SIXTEENTH STREET,
New York, May 20, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
Produce Exchange Building, New York City.

MY DEAR SIR: I would reply to your letter of inquiry of the 17th instant as follows:

What would our country be to-day without immigration? Are not the lazy and shiftless rather given to remaining at home, and the bright, active young people those who seek a new country? A glance at the newcomers at the Grand Central Station, bound for the Eastern States, convinces one that generally they are of good appearance and, in many instances, of some means. Our cities should not be their destination, but the country places, especially the vast West, with its immense prairies awaiting the willing toiler. But immigration should be restricted, and the vicious and degraded excluded.

Very truly, yours,

(Signed)

JAMES QUINLAN.

[Copy.]

No. 60.]

No. 113 WEST FORTIETH STREET,
New York, May 25, 1907.

MY DEAR SIR: Your letter of the 23d instant has just reached me, and I am glad to learn from it that the National Board of Trade has taken up the question of immigration.

Of course I am unable to speak for this State, and I recognize the congestion of various kinds which is likely to occur in New York from the indiscriminate admission of vast multitudes from older countries.

But, unfortunately, we "set up in business," as the phrase is, by proclaiming ourselves "a refuge for the oppressed," and there would seem to be a grotesque incongruity in slamming the doors in the face of men who are seeking on these shores for the opportunity to earn their own bread and to free themselves from tyrannical rule.

For this reason I should think that the proposition to initiate some mechanism by which a wise distribution could be effected is most opportune, and indeed imperative. Surely there is a place on this continent for great multitudes of people who can earn an honest living and secure a decent home.

Very faithfully, yours,

(Signed)

HENRY C. POTTER.

JOHN J. D. TRENOR, Esq.

[Copy.]

No. 61.]

FREDERICK D. UNDERWOOD,
11 BROADWAY,
New York, May 23, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
Produce Exchange Building, New York.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your favor of the 20th instant, embodying your questions in regard to immigration, and taking up the latter in their sequence:

1. The general influence of immigration in my State, New York, and in some other States, with the conditions in which I am perhaps more familiar than in New York, has been beneficial, as is evidenced by the fact that during the past five years American skilled workmen and artisans have been employed to an unparalleled extent at the highest wages ever known. This was made possible largely by the advent of the immigrant.

2. The tide of immigration has not reached a point where it constitutes a menace to American labor. In reality there are no American laborers.

3. A plan whereunder the distribution of immigrants would be regulated by the federal authorities might prove beneficial, thereby taking them into the smaller towns.

Immigrants are needed in the State of New York to till the farms that are now practically abandoned, for reasons that are so obvious as to require no portrayal herein.

Noting the postscript to your letter: The influence of immigration, in the past, in the development of the commercial and industrial resources of railways and communities in general, is so apparent as, in my opinion, to make any portrayal mere redundancy. The improvements in terminal facilities, buildings and permanent roadway of the railways, that have been made in the past five years would have been impossible without the aid of immigrant labor. From the nature of the employment, railways are able to work large gangs of men who do not speak or understand a word of English, and these men do not take the place of others. There were no men available, which fact made their importation imperative. This made it possible, as stated above, for artisans of more skill and knowledge to engage in work more congenial to themselves and better adapted to their physical acquirements, at an increased compensation.

The cry that immigration is a menace to America is chimerical. In some large cities there is congestion, but it is purely a local condition. The whole country needs men to till the land and work in the forests and mines.

No substantial advance has been made in the matter of bettering the highways during the past twenty-five years, owing to the scarcity of labor. The State of New York is backward in this respect, owing to the fact that the city of New York and other large cities have absorbed any labor that might have been utilized. If the good-roads movement, which is so essential to the comfort, welfare, and wealth of the urban communities, is to obtain a foothold, it must be done through the medium of inexperienced and unskilled labor, and for

that we must look to the immigrant. There is yet plenty of work for the men who want to work.

Yours, very truly,

(Signed)

F. D. UNDERWOOD.

[Copy.]

No. 62.]

56 BEAVER STREET,
New York, May 23, 1907.

JOHN J. D. TRENOR, Esq.,
Produce Exchange Building, New York.

DEAR SIR: I have your letter of the 22d instant.

1. My personal view, in answer to your first question, is that the general influence of immigration to New York in recent years has, on the whole, been beneficial.

2. The tide of immigration can not, in my judgment, reach a point in a comparatively new and rapidly developing section where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer. On the contrary, I consider that the demands and restrictions ostensibly imposed in the interest of American labor are a decided menace to the fullest and most economical development of the country.

3. In answer to your third proposition, I believe that the laws of supply and demand offer the only effective and rational means for regulating the intelligent distribution of labor. The larger cities afford the greatest opportunities for employment, and in that sense there is congestion in certain centers, and there always will be.

Immigration is needed in New York State for the development of agricultural as well as industrial resources, and, in my opinion, alien labor laws, the restriction of immigration, and all labor organization legislation of that kind is unjust, wicked, and illiberal.

Yours, very truly,

(Signed)

T. P. FOWLER.

[Copy.]

No. 63.]

THE ROME ELECTRICAL COMPANY,
Rome, N. Y., May 18, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your inquiry of May 16 to the president of the Rome Chamber of Commerce, I will answer your questions as fully as I can with as few words as possible.

Question 1. Has the general influence of immigration to your State in recent years been beneficial or otherwise?

Answer. So far as developing industries doing municipal and contract work—such as street work, laying of water and sewer pipes, and filling the demand for laboring jobs—it has been beneficial.

2. In your opinion, has the tide of immigration reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer? If so, what method of restriction would you suggest?

Answer. I believe every laborer of any nation can secure employment at good wages in this country. So far as our home town is concerned, it is impossible to get laborers enough to keep our manufacturing plants running full. There is, to be sure, an undesirable class whose coming to our shores should be restricted, or prohibited entirely, but the better classes from northern Italy and other parts of Europe are very necessary to this country.

3. Do you or do you not think that the fostering of an intelligent plan of distribution by the federal authorities in conjunction with those of the various States would, by relieving the congestion in our larger cities, tend to solve the problem of alleged excessive immigration?

Answer. I believe it would be of great benefit to the country.

4. If in your opinion immigration is needed in your State, is it required for the development of your agricultural as well as your industrial resources?

Answer. It is.

Very truly, yours,

(Signed) GEO. A. CLYDE,
Chairman Executive Committee, Rome Board of Trade.

[Copy.]

No. 64.]

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Schenectady, N. Y., June 4, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
Produce Exchange Building, New York.

DEAR SIR: In response to your inquiries of May 23 I would say that in our neighborhood immigrants have been used largely in the construction of the trolley lines and in doing other similar work, for which native help can not be readily obtained.

The condition of the labor market here is such in this rapidly developing locality that it is difficult to obtain labor in adequate amount, and it has been advantageous to both the immigrant and the community that laborers could be supplied from the immigrant class.

I am inclined to think that the immigrant problem is one of proper distribution, and if the immigrant could be located wisely it would be found that he was an advantage and not a detriment.

In our State the tendency of the able-bodied and intelligent farm hands is toward the cities to engage in industrial pursuits, and if the immigrant classes could be induced to take up farming it would be a good thing.

The foreign element in our city has been increased very greatly of late years from Italy and Slavic countries.

The older German and Irish immigrants are now engaged in a higher class of activities and the new elements do not enter into competition with them in the main, but perform work which these earlier immigrants now consider themselves rather too good to take up.

The new elements are rapidly assimilating, and with occasional marked exceptions appear to develop into good citizens. The Italians

and Poles show strong patriotic tendencies toward the land of their adoption and establish homes and build churches in our midst.

Yours, respectfully,

(Signed)

JACOB W. CLUTE,
Mayor.

(Signed)

JAMES R. TRUAX,
Executive Secretary.

[Copy.]

No. 65.]

UNION COLLEGE, SCHENECTADY, N. Y.,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
May 17, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,

Produce Exchange Building, New York City.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of inquiry of May 16, addressed to the president of the Schenectady Chamber of Commerce.

I find it difficult to reply definitely and satisfactorily to your several questions and would like to take time for fuller consideration, but I feel that if I do not write now the whole subject will escape my mind under the pressure of duties connected with the closing of the college year.

1. While the influence of immigration has been in many respects helpful, I am confident that the general effect has been to bring labor to a lower level and to modify unfavorably the American ideals of character and life.

2. I hesitate to say that immigration has reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the American laborer. I can not regard the interests of the American laborer as something separate from the interests of the community at large, nor as something to be protected for its own sake. To accept such a principle would lead to class legislation to an extent that would be in itself a menace to the general welfare. I do feel, however, that the time has come for us to place some restriction upon immigration, although I have not reached any definite conclusion as to the form which this restriction should take.

3. There is but one answer to your inquiry concerning the desirability of fostering an intelligent plan of distribution. If it is possible to formulate and carry out such a plan, the problem of immigration will be brought much nearer to a solution than it is to-day or can be so long as foreign populations are crowded into our large cities.

The State of New York does not need more citizens, but a better type of citizens. There are people enough in the State to develop all of its resources, both agricultural and industrial.

Yours, very truly,

(Signed)

ANDREW V. RAYMOND.

[Copy.]

No. 66.]

SYRACUSE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Syracuse, N. Y., May 20, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,

Produce Exchange Building, New York City.

DEAR SIR: Your favor of May 16, addressed to the president of the Syracuse Chamber of Commerce, has been referred by him to me for answer. In reply thereto I would say in answer to questions:

1. That with the increase in the demand for unskilled labor in this State owing to construction and other operations, it would have been practically impossible for the State to have made the strides that it has made without the supply of labor resulting from immigration.

2. To-day in this city and practically in this State the job is seeking the man, the man is not seeking the job, so that it is hard to figure in what way immigration can be a menace to labor.

In spite of these facts I believe that immigration should be restricted along lines which would insure to America a class of citizens not necessarily educated, but at least of sound bodies and of sound minds.

3. I do think that the fostering of an intelligent plan of distribution by the federal authorities in connection with those of the State would be of value in preventing congestion in the cities. Unquestionably immigration is needed for agricultural as well as industrial labor.

Yours, very truly,

(Signed)

HARLOW C. CLARK,
Secretary.

[Copy.]

No. 67.]

MAYOR'S OFFICE,
Troy, N. Y., May 31, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,

Produce Exchange Building, New York.

DEAR SIR: Acknowledging receipt of your letter dated May 23, 1907, I reply to your inquiries as follows:

1. Has the general influence of immigration to your State in recent years been beneficial or otherwise?

I believe it to be beneficial in many ways.

2. In your opinion, has the tide of immigration reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer?

The American laborer was never in my recollection so well paid and so fully employed as at present; hence I can not see that his interests are menaced.

3. Do you or do you not think that the fostering of an intelligent plan of distribution by the federal authorities in conjunction with those of the various States would, by relieving the congestion in our larger cities, tend to solve the problem of alleged excessive immigration?

An intelligent plan of distributing immigration is as essential as the plans for the reclamation and irrigation of arid lands. After one is accomplished there is need for the other. Immigration will be regulated by the profitableness of the occupation afforded. When

the immense movement now in force subsides, the immigrant will gravitate to agricultural pursuits. Our acreage is large, our prosperity in its infancy, our resources unbounded, and so long as the character of the immigrant is reputable, his object in coming to improve his condition, and his mode of life and habits are not radically at variance with our standards, he should be welcomed.

Yours, respectfully,

(Signed)

ELIAS P. MANN,
Mayor.

[Copy.]

No. 68.]

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
North Dakota, May 17, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
Produce Exchange Building,
New York City.

MY DEAR SIR: Yours of recent date duly received, and in reply thereto give the following answers to your questions:

First. The general influence of immigration to this State in recent years has been beneficial. Of course a large part of the immigration has come to this State from other States in the Union, and were already American citizens before coming here. Quite a few, however, have come direct from Norway, Sweden, Russia, and Germany. They are all a good class of immigrants, and make good citizens.

Second. In my opinion immigration has not interfered with American laborers in this State. In fact, we had great difficulty in securing laborers to put in the crop this year. I sent the commissioner of immigration to St. Paul and Minneapolis to secure laborers for the farms in this State, and they were secured with great difficulty. In many places in this State at least 25 per cent of the teams were idle for some one to drive them. Because of the scarcity of labor and the lateness of the spring, it is estimated that there will be 30 per cent less wheat sown than last year.

Third. I believe that it would be a great blessing if Congress would appropriate a large sum of money at each session to enable the poor people who are living in the congested cities from hand to mouth to get out into States like North Dakota, where they could get a home of their own and soon acquire a competence. Such action would in a large measure solve the problem of so-called excessive immigration. Immigration is needed in our State for the development of our agricultural and industrial resources. This State is destined to be one of the great States of this Union. It is practically all agricultural land, excepting a strip in the western part of the State known as the "Bad Lands," and it is splendid grazing country. The whole middle and western part of the State is underlaid with lignite coal. The western part has the very best of clays for the manufacture of the finest kinds of potteries and bricks, and yet there are places in this State where a man can go and get 160 acres of land, by paying the filing fee, and making his home on it for the time required by law.

I inclose you herewith a map, from which you can get some statistics relative to agricultural and other resources of this State.

Yours, very truly,

(Signed)

JOHN BURKE.

[Copy.]

No. 69.]

STATE OF OHIO, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
*Columbus, May 16, 1907.*Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
Produce Exchange Building,
New York.

MY DEAR SIR: Replying to your favor of May 14, the governor directs me to state that the general influence of immigration in Ohio in recent years has been beneficial because of the unusual demand for labor, which is in some places still not fully supplied.

The tide of immigration has not reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of American labor in this State so long as existing conditions remain. In some quarters the prosperity which gives the unusual demand for labor could hardly be considered normal. If the present prosperity should not continue, then the question of restriction might be more necessary here, as it evidently is now in your city and in some of the other large cities.

The governor approves of your plan of fostering an intelligent distribution by the federal authorities in conjunction with the States for the relief of the larger cities.

The demand for labor is not for the development of the agricultural interests or of the established industries at this time, but mostly for extraordinary improvements. The railroads are doubling the tracks here as they have done formerly in the East, and the State has just entered upon the rejuvenation of its canals. These are the two quarters from which the great demand for labor comes.

Yours, very truly,

(Signed)

S. J. FLICKINGER, *Secretary.*

[Copy.]

No. 70.]

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *June 6, 1907.*Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
Produce Exchange Building, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your favor of the 23d, in which you ask my opinion on immigration—

I would say that my attitude is to allow every person coming into our country the fullest liberty. I would neither subsidize or restrict immigration except to protect ourselves from an influx of peculiarly undesirable people who would not become interested in our institutions.

My reason for this stand is that I have no knowledge of any country where population by natural increase or immigration has ever exceeded the means of subsistence. On the other hand, I am convinced that the dangers you anticipate from immigration are but the result of monopoly fostered by our laws.

With this in mind, my efforts are directed against monopoly, to the end that natural opportunities may be equal. To accomplish this, it is absolutely necessary that we abolish a system of taxation that by levying on labor products imposes a penalty on industry and thrift. In place of it I would establish a system where men would contribute to the expenses of government proportionate to benefits received.

You of course realize that expenditures of public money in a community enhance land values only.

Sincerely, yours,

(Signed)

TOM L. JOHNSON.

[Copy.]

No. 71.]

THE HOCKING VALLEY RAILWAY CO.,
Columbus, Ohio, June 5, 1907.

MR. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,

Produce Exchange Building, New York.

DEAR SIR: Your circular letter in the interest of the National Board of Trade in connection with the question of immigration, addressed to the president of this company, has been referred to me, and in reply would say, speaking of course from the railway standpoint:

1. Immigration to this State in recent years has been beneficial, for without the Italian and Greek laborers it would be difficult to secure a sufficient supply of men for railroad track work.

2. In my opinion, so far as our lines of railway and the State of Ohio are concerned, immigration of laborers has not yet reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborers.

3. An intelligent plan of distribution by the federal authorities would, no doubt, aid in relieving the congestion in the larger cities, and scatter immigrants more generally over the country where they could engage in agricultural as well as industrial pursuits.

It is my observation that agricultural laborers are always in demand throughout the central and northern parts of this State to supply the places of the children of farmers who move to the cities and towns and secure employment there.

Yours, truly,

(Signed)

F. B. SHELDON,
Assistant to President.

P. S. Please accept this letter as replying also to your letter of May 22, addressed to Decatur Axtell, esq., chairman of Board of Directors, Ohio Central Lines, Richmond, Va., which was recently referred to me.

[Copy.]

No. 72.]

THE DAYTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Dayton, Ohio, May 27, 1907.

MR. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,

Produce Exchange Building, New York.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your letter of May 16, containing inquiries regarding the "immigration question," I am frank to say that I am unable to give you much information, or to offer suggestions that would be of very great value.

There has been but little immigration to this part of Ohio in the past twenty years, our labor is to a large extent native and the advantages and disadvantages of immigration demanded no consideration from our manufacturing and business interests.

I believe, however, that on the whole the influence of immigration on this State has been beneficial, as our farming class has been built

up from that source and common labor is always in demand. It has not reached a point in this district where it has become, or is likely to become, a menace to the interests of American labor, and on the other hand it is not required in Ohio for the purposes of industrial or agricultural development.

The question is a broad one, and as Dayton is not one of the congested labor points, its citizens would be poor judges, and our opinions would be of little value.

Thanking you for your courtesy,
I am, respectfully,

(Signed) THEO. FLUHART,
President Dayton Chamber of Commerce.

[Copy.]

No. 73.]

EXECUTIVE OFFICES,
City of Toledo, June 3, 1907.

JOHN J. D. TRENOR, Esq.,

Produce Exchange Building, New York City.

DEAR SIR: I fear that I can not throw very great light upon the subject of immigration, for my study of the question has not been very deep or extensive. In answer to your questions, however, it seems to me that the general influence of immigration to the State of Ohio in recent years has been beneficial. Here in our city we have a number of communities that are composed almost entirely of foreign population, and I think the people living there are making good citizens; indeed, I have found that among our foreign population, the real American ideals of equality and liberty are as well understood as they are by those classes who have lived several generations in this country; they seem to have a more simple and naïve conception of what America really is than many of those who pride themselves on a long lineage on this side of the water. Of course, I know that this idea of equality is complained of by many people, still I believe it is what America stands for.

In the second place, in my opinion, the tide of immigration has not reached the point where it constitutes a serious menace to American labor.

As to your third question; I think that the fostering of an intelligent plan of distribution by the federal authorities, in conjunction with those of the various States, would possibly, by relieving the congestion in our larger cities, tend to solve the problem of our alleged excessive immigration; but I do not know what an intelligent plan would be, and I am not sure that there has been excessive immigration. I think it is unfair to ascribe all the evils we suffer to immigrants. I can see just as many evils arising from the conduct and lives and ideals of those families that have lived in this country for generations, and I say this as one whose ancestors have lived in America since the middle of the 17th Century. I believe in fundamental democracy; I think that America was meant for all men, and I do not want to shut anybody out; I believe that in time all the problems that annoy us will be solved, and that this democracy will justify itself.

Yours, very sincerely,

(Signed) BRAND WHITLOCK.

[Copy.]

No. 74.] STATE OF OREGON, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Salem, May 23, 1907.

JOHN J. D. TRENOR, Esq.,
Produce Exchange Building, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your favor of the 14th instant. In reply, permit me to answer your questions in the order in which they are stated in your letter.

First. The general influence of immigration to this State in recent years has been beneficial.

Second. The tide of immigration here has not reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer.

Third. There is only one solution of the problem of excessive immigration and congestion in the larger cities, and that is rigid enforcement of present immigration laws and the adoption of others that would be still more stringent as to terms. I can not understand why the United States should permit such excessive immigration and then undertake to solve such questions as congestion in larger cities and the proper distribution of immigrants.

Fourth. We are not particularly in need of immigration to this State, further than a splendid class of emigrants who are coming here from the Middle West.

I have the honor to remain,

Yours, very respectfully,

(Signed)

GEO. E. CHAMBERLAIN.

[Copy.]

No. 75.] THE HARRISBURG BOARD OF TRADE,
Harrisburg, Pa., May 18, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
Produce Exchange Building, New York City.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your esteemed favor of May 16, relative to immigration, would say that I find this matter depends largely upon locality and conditions. In my answers I can only speak for my immediate vicinity and do not wish to be put on record for State.

No. 1. The influence of immigration has been beneficial to us, as we could not possibly man our large iron and steel industries without the foreign labor.

No. 2. Not with us, as we are advertising for 1,000 American laborers for our mills.

No. 3. We would favor an intelligent plan of distribution, according to demands of localities.

Immigration in our section is required for our industrial benefit, and, in a few cases, for our agricultural, as we have here in Dauphin County small farms in our mountains, purchased by Germans and developed to a high state of cultivation and production, the products, of a fine character, coming into our local markets.

Trusting I have fully answered your inquiry, and again calling your attention to the fact that I am speaking only for my immediate locality, I am,

Very truly, yours,

(Signed)

JAMES A. BELL,
Manager.

[Copy.]

No. 76.]

THE PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY,
Philadelphia, Pa., May 24, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,

Produce Exchange Building, New York City.

DEAR SIR: Replying to yours of 22d instant, this company does not keep such data as would enable me to officially reply to your queries, and I can, therefore, only express a personal opinion, which I do as follows:

Question 1. I would say the general influence of immigration upon our State in recent years has been on the whole beneficial.

Question 2. I can not see that the tide of immigration has reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer. I think the American laborer—and by this I presume is meant the native-born American—is a rare commodity. If all foreign labor was debarred, wages of American labor would, of course, rise, but concurrently all work of any magnitude throughout the country would come to a standstill, as there would be none to carry it out. I believe we have laws sufficient at present, if they were systematically and vigorously enforced, to cover the only method of restriction I would raise, namely, good health, character, and the ability to fairly read some language. Bearing in mind the radical difference in the educational opportunities of this country compared with Europe and other countries, we must be reasonable in our educational requirements.

Question 3. I believe that the fostering of an intelligent plan of distribution by the federal authorities, in conjunction with those of the various States, might tend to solve the problem of alleged excessive immigration, and might temporarily relieve the congestion in the larger cities, but such a plan would make the Government and States largely responsible for the success or failure of the immigrant; would also make it necessary that advice be given to the immigrant before starting for this country as to where he would be located; would also require the federal and state authorities to provide safeguards whereby proper accommodations and treatment would be accorded to the immigrant in the place where he was located by government order; and, finally, I question, if such location was intelligently made, whether the larger bodies of immigrants would not move to the large cities upon the first opportunity.

Immigration is needed in the State of Pennsylvania primarily for the development of industrial resources, but if immigrants could be induced to undertake agricultural development, there is a big field for them here, although in the line of agriculture greater success might attend their efforts in some of the Southern or Western States.

It would have been impossible to have carried on the commercial and industrial developments of this country during the past seven or ten years if the supply of foreign labor had been materially restricted. An examination of all new railroad work, municipal works, cleaning of city streets, etc., will show that the actual labor is being performed by foreigners, and that recently on many western and southern railroads this character of work has been materially delayed

owing to the scarcity of labor, and this notwithstanding the enormous influx of foreigners.

I trust that these personal comments of mine may be of some service to you.

Yours, truly,

(Signed) SAML. REA,
Third Vice-President.

[Copy.]

No. 77.]

P. H. HAMBURGER COMPANY,
Pittsburg, Pa., June 4, 1907.

Mr. H. D. W. ENGLISH,
President Chamber of Commerce, Pittsburg, Pa.

DEAR SIR: I take pleasure in answering the questions asked in Mr. John J. D. Trenor's letter to the Hon. George W. Guthrie, and which you referred to me.

I heartily agree with the conclusions reached by the very intelligent committee on resolutions of the National Civic Federation at its immigration conference, which report was adopted unanimously, and many of the suggestions contained in that report have been favorably received by the United States Congress, and some of the ideas therein advocated have been added to the statutory laws in reference to immigration, and the résumé of these resolutions meant that it was more a question of the intelligent distribution of the immigrants rather than an immigrant problem itself. The Southwest, and West itself, are clamoring for immigrants, and the State of South Carolina has aided immigrants to reach its shores. If the steamship companies would land immigrants at Galveston, New Orleans, Savannah, and Charleston, for instance, and on the Pacific slope, there is no question of their being taken care of; but the great tendency has been to land the vast bulk of them in New York, and some in Boston, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, with the result that the congestion, especially in New York City, has been tremendous.

With the great amount of undeveloped land in the United States and the thinly populated areas, it has been figured that our country can support a far vaster population than it has at present, and it has been estimated that every adult represents a monetary value of from \$500 to \$1,000, that it has cost that much to raise that adult, and that the labor performed by him is an asset of the State, so much so that certain European countries have tried to restrict emigration. Of course, the tendency has been for immigrants to go to those places where their friends are, and it is therefore quite a problem to work out the intelligent distribution. For instance, it would be foolish to send an iron worker to a farm or region where there is no iron, a tailor to picking cotton, and there are many problems that enter into this phase of the question.

As far as the State of Pennsylvania is concerned, the immigrant has been needed for its development in our industries, in our mines, mills, and factories, and our household help comes largely from this source.

In answer to the question: "Has the general influence of immigration to Pennsylvania in recent years been beneficial or otherwise,"

I would say that materially it has been decidedly beneficial, and as a rule the immigrant has been found to be a law-abiding citizen, and that in a great number of cases reported in the papers where foreigners have been guilty of infraction of borough laws, that an investigation proves that these have been minor offences, petty infractions of police regulations, and, in spite of the reports of the average news gatherer, an investigation of the penal institutions of our country reveals that the great bulk of criminals are not of foreign birth, but are native born and can at least read and write, and would generally be spoken of as intelligent citizens.

In answer to the question: "In your opinion has the tide of immigration reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer? If so, what method of restriction would you suggest?" I would say that the best answer to that is the extraordinary high wages received by laborers and the crying demand for men to work in almost every industry. I am not in favor of restriction, so-called, and I do not favor an educational test. The only restriction I am in favor of is to keep out the beggar, the criminal, the weak-minded, the insane, those suffering from loathsome or incurable diseases, and those adults incapable of earning their own sustenance. I am not in favor of keeping those out of firm mind and physically strong, who have committed no political crimes, because England and America have always posed as the asylum for the oppressed of all mankind, and, in the words of Emerson, "America stands for opportunity," and that opportunity should be every man's. My investigation of this subject convinces me that there are more criminals coming to our country in the first cabin than in the steerage.

We have inherited the priceless boon of freedom and the blessings of a free country, and its privileges should be passed along to our fellow-men uncurtailed and unimpaired.

I would refer Mr. Trenor to the annual report of the Commissioner-General of Immigration, which gives the statistics so fully and the arrival and distribution of immigrants in the United States, for if I were to start to give the statistics I am afraid I would make this answer much too long.

Trusting that my views may be of some service, I am,

Yours, respectfully,

(Signed)

ALBERT M. HAUAUER.

No. 78.]

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND.

In answer to my letter of May 14, 1907, the Hon. James H. Higgins, governor of the State of Rhode Island, replied as follows:

Question 1. Has the general influence of immigration to your State in recent years been beneficial or otherwise?

Answer. Has not affected our State materially one way or the other as yet.

Question 2. In your opinion has the tide of immigration reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer?

Answer. Not yet.

Question 3. Do you, or do you not, think that the fostering of an intelligent plan of distribution by the federal authorities in conjunction with those of the various States would, by relieving the congestion in the larger cities, tend to solve the problem of alleged excessive immigration?

Answer. I think it would, at least at present.

No. 79.]

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, CITY OF CHARLESTON, S. C.

In answer to my letter of May 23, 1907, the Hon. R. G. Rhett, mayor of the city of Charleston, replied as follows:

Question 1. Has the general influence of immigration to your State in recent years been beneficial or otherwise?

Answer. Beneficial.

Question 2. In your opinion has the tide of immigration reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer?

Answer. No.

Question 3. Do you, or do you not, think that the fostering of an intelligent plan of distribution by the federal authorities in conjunction with those of the various States would, by relieving the congestion in our larger cities, tend to solve the problem of alleged excessive immigration?

Answer. Am inclined to think so.

Question 4. If in your opinion immigration is needed in your State, is it required for the development of your agricultural as well as your industrial resources?

Answer. Yes.

[Copy.]

No. 80.]

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
COMMERCE, AND IMMIGRATION,
STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
Columbia, S. C., May 25, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
Produce Exchange Building,
New York City.

DEAR SIR: Your letters of May 14, the one addressed to the governor of the State of South Carolina and the other to the Chamber of Commerce of this city, have both been referred to this office for answer. As you are doubtless aware, this department has been the pioneer in practical work for the proper selection and distribution of American immigration, and I only wish that I had the time to answer at more length most of the questions propounded by you. You will perhaps recall that we met personally some years prior to my taking the active part that I have in the last few years in immigration matters.

Answering concisely the questions propounded by you:

1. Exceedingly beneficial.

2. No; the interests of the American laborer are not yet menaced, nor are they likely to be soon, but the horde of people of undesirable nationalities now pouring into this country is creating sociological and other problems, and in certain congested centers produce exceedingly undesirable conditions. I believe there should be provisions in the United States laws looking to the selection of people at their own homes by representatives of the several States, acquainted with the labor necessities of those States, such representatives working in close cooperation with United States department and consular officials, if necessary, under an international agreement.

3. There is no possible plan, intelligent or unintelligent, that will bring about the distribution at the great ports of entry where the congestion of population is greatest, for the reason that these people are like so many sheep, desiring to herd together and remain in one place, and for the still further reason that the prevailing scale of wages that

they hear of at these centers are higher than in the sparsely settled sections. These people can not understand that the lower scale of wages prevailing in the latter, taken in conjunction with the lower cost of living, means more to them at the end of the year than were it possible for them to find employment at the higher scale. I have personally tried the matter of diverting the immigrant newly arrived and long arrived from the great cities into the agricultural districts, and I do not hesitate to say that it is just as impossible a proposition as an attempt to go to Europe with an air ship. The diversion and the distribution must be made from the sources of supply abroad, and if our present condition in the great centers of population is to be bettered, greater restriction must be placed on the incoming of so many people of the lower order of intelligence—the people that are commonly called “undesirables.”

Immigration is needed in this State primarily for the development of thousands and thousands of acres of valuable lands. At this time we do not need, nor are we seeking, the skilled tradesman, but with the increase of population, the building up of the agricultural and manufacturing industries, the need for the skilled tradesman will be created, and he will find work in sections where it does not exist to-day.

Trusting that the above has answered fully the questions propounded, believe me,

Very truly, yours,

(Signed)

E. J. WATSON,
Commissioner.

[Copy.]

No. 81.]

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
May 24, 1907.

MR. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,

Produce Exchange Building, New York, N. Y.

SIR: Yours of recent date addressed to me as governor of South Dakota, received. The queries propounded by you are answered as follows:

1. Has the general influence of immigration to your State in recent years been beneficial or otherwise?

Answer. It has been beneficial.

2. In your opinion, has the tide of immigration reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer? If so, what method of restriction would you suggest?

Answer. In my judgment, the tide of immigration to this country has not yet reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer. For instance, in the State of South Dakota, we have not laboring men enough to meet the demand. Both contractors and farmers experience very great difficulty in securing the services of a sufficient number of laboring men. The difficulty extends to both skilled and unskilled labor and to union as well as nonunion labor. Legislation on this subject should, of course, so far as possible, exclude “undesirables,” but it should not restrict immigration of honest, law-abiding laboring men, no matter from what country they come.

3. Do you, or do you not, think that the fostering of an intelligent plan of distribution by the federal authorities in conjunction with those of the various States would, by relieving the congestion in our larger cities, tend to solve the problem of alleged excessive immigration?

Answer. I do.

4. If, in your opinion, immigration is needed in your State, is it required for the development of your agricultural as well as your industrial resources?

Answer. It is.

Very respectfully, yours,

(Signed)

COE I. CRAWFORD,
Governor.

No. 82.] EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, NASHVILLE, TENN.

In answer to my letter of May 23, 1907, the Hon. T. O. Morris mayor of the city of Nashville, Tenn., replied as follows:

Question 1. Has the general influence of immigration to your State in recent years been beneficial or otherwise?

Answer. Not enough to see if influenced in either direction.

Question 2. In your opinion, has the tide of immigration reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer?

Answer. Not in this State.

Question 3. Do you, or do you not, think that the fostering of an intelligent plan of distribution by the federal authorities, in conjunction with those of the various States, would, by relieving the congestion in our larger cities, tend to solve the problem of alleged excessive immigration?

Answer. Yes.

Question 4. If in your opinion immigration is needed in your State, is it required for the development of your agricultural as well as your industrial resources?

Answer. Not required at all here.

[Copy.]

No. 83.] DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, INSURANCE,
STATISTICS, AND HISTORY, STATE OF TEXAS,
Austin, May 28, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
New York.

DEAR SIR: Your letter with reference to immigration addressed to the governor was referred to me.

The general influence of immigration to our State has been very beneficial. We are greatly in need of more labor in all the departments of business in Texas, the demand being far in excess of our supply. Therefore the tide has not reached a point where immigration could be considered a menace to the interests of the American laborer. I think it would be wise for the federal authorities to distribute immigration throughout the country, and thus relieve the congestion in the cities. But we want a better class of immigration than is now flocking to this country from Russia, Hungary, and Italy. All of our resources in Texas need labor. We could easily find room here for forty or fifty millions.

Yours, truly,

(Signed)

R. F. MILNER.

No. 84.]

[Copy.]

THE HOUSTON AND TEXAS CENTRAL RAILROAD CO.,
Houston, Tex., May 25, 1907.

IMMIGRATION.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,

Produce Exchange Building, New York.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of May 20, addressed to President Lovett, has been referred to me. Answering categorically the questions asked by you, I beg to advise as follows:

First. The influence of immigration to the State of Texas has been beneficial.

Second. The tide of immigration has not reached a point where it constitutes a menace to American labor. The restrictions which should be imposed on immigration ought to exclude, of course, paupers, immigrants of well-known vicious character, anarchists, and other such classes who would prove undesirable citizens.

Third. Any plan which would distribute the immigrants throughout the agricultural sections of the country should be fostered, not only by the national, but by the state governments. If possible to prevent it, immigrants should be kept away from the crowded cities, and should be distributed through agricultural communities, which, without exception, are always short of labor. This plan would not only be a direct benefit to the development of the resources of the United States, but would be of material benefit to the immigrants themselves, as well as a benefit to their children, to have the latter brought up in rural communities, away from the vices and temptations of large cities.

There is plenty of work to do in this country for people who want to work, but we have no room for the idle or the vicious.

Yours, very truly,

(Signed) T. FAY.

[Copy.]

No. 85.] SAN ANTONIO AND ARANSAS PASS RAILWAY CO.,
San Antonio, Tex., May 31, 1907.

Mr. W. M. HOBBS,

First Vice-President and General Manager.

DEAR SIR: Returning attached letter from Mr. John J. D. Trenor, of New York, I beg to recommend the following:

In reply to his question No. 1:

The general influence of immigration to the State of Texas in recent years has been decidedly beneficial.

In reply to question No. 2:

Immigration in Texas has not been a menace to the interest of our laborers. I answer so far as Texas is concerned. I am not in a position to pass a creditable opinion as to the condition in other parts of the United States, but so far as I can learn from the newspaper reports I am inclined to think that unless certain protections

are thrown around immigrants coming to this country the United States will be compelled to deal with very grave and serious questions.

We have too many people coming to this country who, after they remain a short time and accumulate a little money, endeavor to make the conditions here the same as they left in the "old country." In plain words, they have not become Americanized.

No American citizen can vote or exercise the right of citizenship under the age of 21 years, and I believe that no alien should be allowed to vote without having remained in the United States for a period of not less than five years.

In answer to question No. 3:

I believe that it would be a wise plan to have the federal authorities undertake to relieve the congestion in the larger cities. We are not so much interested in immigration from foreign countries to settle up our State as we are in getting the better class of people from the more thickly populated Northern and Western States.

Yours, truly,

(Signed)

GEO. F. LUPTON,
General Passenger Agent.

[Copy.]

No. 86.] COMMONWEALTH OF UTAH, EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Salt Lake, May 23, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,

Produce Exchange Building, New York.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your favor of May 14, in which you ask certain questions regarding the matter of immigration to Utah. I will take up your questions seriatim, and give you brief answers which I hope will cover the necessary ground.

1. The general influence of immigration to this State has always been beneficial. Most of the immigrants are from the northern and central nations of Europe, and from different parts of the United States. They quickly become assimilated with our citizenship, and their thrift and industry add greatly to the wealth and prestige of the State. Of late years, however, a larger proportion of less desirable citizens have been received, chiefly Greeks, Austrians, Italians, Japanese, etc.

2. The classes just named constitute the greatest present menace to American labor. They are employed chiefly by large corporations; and it is a noticeable fact that many of them are inclined to be turbulent and un-American. In addition to this, they send fully 75 per cent of their earnings out of the country, retaining merely enough to support them in a more or less squalid style of living. As to the desirability of restricting this class of immigrants, and the best way of accomplishing it if desirable, I would say merely this: The Federal Government might apply general test of desirability of immigrants, basing it not on one, but several grounds. It could be guided by the general experience had with these various classes of immigrants in the past, as reported from the various States. I believe Utah would stand by the Government in applying such a test, for our State has always been proud of the general standard of its immigration.

3. I believe that one of the greatest dangers of immigration is the crowding of the illiterate and the poor classes of immigrants in the large cities. I should be heartily in favor of any practical plan that could be devised by the Government and the States in conjunction, to distribute the immigrants in localities well removed from the large cities. Speaking for Utah, I can say with emphasis that we need good immigrants; but we should greatly prefer genuine homeseekers, whose intention it is to become permanent residents, with homes and farms of their own, and their interests identical with ours. We need them for the development of our agricultural resources, as there are many thousands of acres of land now being brought under cultivation by arid farming, which will provide homes for many times the present population of the State. Our industrial resources are also enlarging to a marked degree, and the assistance of intelligent, industrious immigrants is needed in their further development.

Trusting that the data here given will serve your purpose, I remain,

Yours, very truly,

(Signed)

JOHN C. CUTLER,
Governor of Utah.

[Copy.]

No. 87.]

SEABOARD AIR LINE RAILWAY,
Norfolk, Va., June 9, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,

Produce Exchange Building, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of May 22, addressed to our former president, Mr. Alfred Walter, deceased, has been referred to me for answer.

You appreciate that the questions put by you cover a very broad scope, and, of course, we can only answer them from the conditions in the territory that we serve, appreciating that there are similar conditions in other fields; that is, the North, as well as the West. I might say, however, that our industrial institutions, possibly with a few exceptions, are not hampered by labor unions. This we feel is accounted for by the absence of foreign element. In answering the questions put I quote them, and follow with the answer:

1. Question. Has the general influence of immigration to your State in recent years been beneficial or otherwise?

Answer. Immigration to the Southern States has not been general. There have been some aliens among those who have settled, but the movement has consisted principally of Americanized foreigners with a sprinkling of natives from Northern and Western States. The general influence has been extremely beneficial, but would have been more so had the numbers been augmented by laborers rather than to have been confined to landholding farmers.

2. Question. In your opinion has the tide of immigration reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American labor? If so, what method of restriction would you suggest?

Answer. From our standpoint, there has been no menace and we are able to assimilate many more skilled and unskilled laborers without detriment to the American laborer.

3. Question. Do you, or do you not, think that the fostering of an intelligent plan of distribution by the federal authorities in conjunction with those of the various States would, by relieving the congestion in our larger cities, tend to solve the problem of alleged excessive immigration?

(b) If in your opinion immigration is needed in your State, is it required for the development of your agricultural as well as your industrial resources?

Answer. This is a far-reaching question, and apparently would be in conflict with our laws with respect to free citizenship. If, however, a feasible plan could be devised whereby the Government would aid the separate States through the medium of advice based upon actual knowledge of the conditions, then a distribution could be effected, but hardly to the extent of solving alleged excessive immigration. Our experience is that immigrants follow channels through which originally directed. Until recently the South made no bid for foreigners, while the North sought the laborer and the West the farmer. By reason of settlements from these causes the numbers have increased, kindred ties and nationalities being strong agencies in the influencing of people to various localities. The congestion in the larger cities is due largely, though not wholly, to these causes as well. It is quite true that the land values of the West have increased to an extent that will hardly justify, or rather permit, the immigrant of to-day being a landowner. The great tide which is now flowing over the borders into Canada opens a new phase of the question and at the same time will leave considerable room and opportunities, though at larger figures than the early settlers were able to purchase at. In fact, I think that you will agree with me that this feature—increased land values throughout the West—is largely responsible for the exodus of people from the Western States into Alberta, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan. It is a new country, full of promise and with farms for the asking. Immigration has been kept out of the South by the institution of slavery; its people did not care for it; lack of knowledge of the true conditions. There is room for the negro and work for the white man in lines of industrial and agricultural pursuits that will not necessarily place them in competition. The people now want immigration; the true facts in connection with the South are becoming known; to-day we are able to offer a new country having all the advantages of an old one.

We do not believe that it will ever be possible to start the flow of immigration southward except upon the plan of assembling similar people in one spot, instructing and aiding them until they acquire our customs and our language. When these colonies of desirable people shall have been scattered through the South, not only will a great deal of land be utilized agriculturally, but from the settlements will radiate sufficient labor for all our needs.

(b) Answer. Immigrants are needed throughout the entire South and can be used advantageously in all industrial and agricultural pursuits.

In studying this question it is impossible for a person to look at it from an entirely sectional standpoint. The North has been radically changed and the West almost entirely built up by immigrants. Under such circumstances it can only be expected that their customs

will largely predominate, and wherever they are found in large numbers their influence must necessarily affect the natives.

We are clamoring for desirable people of all classes. If we should receive them, no one can predict what, through their influence, the future will be. They may meet all of our requirements and be the benefit that we hope and expect them to be. At any rate, old traditions have given way and the people of the South are ready to try the experiment by welcoming and fostering the alien if he will elect to reside with us.

Very truly, yours,

(Signed)

L. SEVIER,
Vice-President.

[Copy.]

No. 88.]

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Richmond, Va., May 27, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,

Produce Exchange Building, New York City.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of May 23, concerning Italian immigration is to hand to-day. I have not the time nor the information necessary to make any extensive reply to your inquiries and must confine myself to a very brief statement of my personal convictions on the subject of your inquiries.

So far as the State of Virginia is concerned, I think the only class of immigrants desirable here are people who have established at home a character for honesty, sobriety, industry, and intelligence. I am utterly opposed to the indiscriminate introduction of immigrants into this State and have no desire to push forward the material interests of the people by the sacrifice of the purity and character of our own people. I desire to see nothing but the best people introduced into this State. I would rather wait a hundred years for the prosperity so much desired than to purchase it by the sacrifice of our present peaceful, loyal, and virtuous conditions.

Personally, I am not an advocate of forced immigration or a rapid increase in population to secure material advancement at the sacrifice of things which, in my estimation, are priceless and which ought to be preserved by any amount of continuous sacrifice.

Yours, very truly,

(Signed)

CARLTON MCCARTHY.

/

[Copy.]

No. 89.]

CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO RAILWAY COMPANY,
PRESIDENT'S OFFICE,
Richmond, Va., May 27, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,

Produce Exchange Building, New York City.

DEAR SIR: I have your letter of the 20th instant, and beg to answer the questions contained therein as follows:

1. In my opinion the general influence of immigration to Virginia in recent years has been beneficial.

2. The tide of immigration has not yet reached a point in the South where it constitutes a menace to the interests of Americans.

3. Immigration is principally needed in Virginia for the development of agricultural resources.

I send you under separate cover a copy of the annual report for 1906 of Mr. George W. Koener, commissioner of agriculture for Virginia, and a pamphlet on the subject of farm labor in Virginia, which may interest you.

Yours, very truly,

(Signed)

GEO. W. STEVENS.

[Copy.]

No. 90.] NORFOLK AND WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY,
Roanoke, Va., May 24, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR.

Produce Exchange Building, New York City.

DEAR SIR: Your favor of May 22, and replying to your interrogatories seriatim:

1. Has the general influence of immigration to your State in recent years been beneficial or otherwise?—Answer. So far as the State of Virginia is concerned, I am of the opinion (and that opinion is based upon very considerable knowledge of the foreign element that has come into this State during the past ten years) that the general influence of immigration to this State in recent years has been beneficial, particularly so from a commercial standpoint. So far as the general citizenship is concerned, I do not believe that the State has as yet derived any benefit; and my views in connection with this matter are that the people of the State will largely influence the foreign element for good or bad. If the immigrant that comes to this country is properly treated and given an opportunity to improve his condition financially, morally, and socially, the State will derive great benefits from them as citizens. If, to the contrary, they do not give the immigrant an opportunity to earn fair wages and treat them with due consideration, the result will be otherwise.

2. In your opinion, has the tide of immigration reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer? If so, what method of restriction would you suggest?—Answer. No; the tide of immigration has not reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer. I have been an employer of labor for more than thirty years, and during that time I have never known such a demand for labor with an inadequate supply as during the past two years; and should the present and recent past demand for products of this country continue, the demand for labor will far exceed the supply.

3. Do you, or do you not, think that the fostering of an intelligent plan of distribution by the federal authorities in conjunction with those of the various States would, by relieving the congestion in our larger cities, tend to solve the problem of alleged excessive immigration? If, in your opinion, immigration is needed in your State, is it required for the development of your agricultural as well as your industrial resources?—Answer. In reply to the first paragraph: It

is unquestionably true that the fostering of an intelligent plan of distribution by the federal authorities in conjunction with those of the various States would, by relieving the congestion in our larger cities, tend to solve the problem of excessive immigration. I made an address before the Chamber of Commerce of Petersburg, Va., and take pleasure in sending you a copy of same (under separate cover), and invite your attention to my remarks concerning the question of immigration and negro labor.

In reply to the second paragraph: Immigration is needed in our State particularly for the development of our agricultural resources. There is tributary to the Norfolk and Western Railway more than 3,000,000 acres of tillable land untilled, for which are needed intelligent and comprehensive tillers of the soil.

The lands of Virginia are adapted to a variety of crops. Certain sections, of course, are better adapted to certain classes of crops than others. We have what is known as the tobacco belt, peanut belt, corn and wheat belts, and the blue-grass regions; but in every one of these districts the soil is adapted to diversified farming in various directions, and it is very apparent that we need immigrants who are particularly qualified to take up the agricultural line of business in our State. It naturally follows that with large products from the soil there will be a demand for labor in the industrial departments.

Yours, truly,

(Signed)

L. E. JOHNSON,
President.

[Copy.]

No. 91.]

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
BUREAU OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL STATISTICS,
Madison, May 17, 1907.

MR. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,

Produce Exchange Building, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I have your favor of the 14th instant, addressed to Governor James O. Davidson, and in reply will say that, after reading questions you ask, I can answer them in a general way rather than in a specific way, which will probably be all that you require.

As to the influence of immigration in our State, I will say that as far as immigration from the northern countries of Europe is concerned, I think Wisconsin has been in the main benefited thereby. But I am equally of the opinion that immigration from southern Europe has not been beneficial to this State or to labor. The immigrants from northern Europe have been in the main men and women whose standard of living has been on the level with the standard of living of the people in the State, while those from southern Europe have been much below and have consequently been a hindrance rather than a benefit to good citizenship in Wisconsin.

It appears to me that an immigrant whose standard of living equals that of citizens of a State, he at once becomes a producer as well as a consumer and is not a menace to the interests of labor. But when an immigrant comes to this country whose standard of living is so low that he is not much of a producer and still less a consumer, then he is a menace to our labor and should not be allowed to immigrate to this country.

As I said before, we have both kinds in Wisconsin. Immigrants from northern Europe have been a benefit to us. Those from southern Europe have not, as a general thing.

Very truly, yours,

(Signed)

J. D. BECK,
Commissioner.

[Copy.]

No. 92.]

WISCONSIN CENTRAL RAILWAY,
Milwaukee, Wis., June 7, 1907.

Mr. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
Produce Exchange Building, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Your letter dated the 22d ultimo to our president, Mr. W. A. Bradford, is referred to me for reply.

To question No. 1, I would say that the influence of immigration has been very beneficial.

To No. 2: The tide of immigration has not reached a point where it constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer in our State; in fact, good help is very scarce.

To No. 3: I would be in favor of an intelligent plan of distribution by the federal authorities in conjunction with those of the various States, and I do think it would tend to solve the problem of alleged excessive immigration. Over one-half of the tillable lands in our State are still unoccupied. I believe that immigration is needed in Wisconsin, particularly for the development of agriculture, and that it would materially assist in industrial resources.

I shall be pleased to give you any further information I can on the subject, and will appreciate having any matter that is published through your efforts..

Yours, very truly,

(Signed)

WM. H. KILLEN,
Land and Industrial Commissioner.

[Copy.]

No. 93.]

THE STATE OF WYOMING,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Cheyenne, May 17, 1907.

Hon. JOHN J. D. TRENOR,
Produce Exchange Building, New York City, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Replying to the question relative to immigration submitted in your communication of May 14, will state:

First. That the general influence of immigration in Wyoming has been very beneficial.

Second. That there is no indication here that the tide of immigration constitutes a menace to the interests of the American laborer.

Third. That an intelligent plan of distribution by the authorities, in conjunction with those of various States, would unquestionably prove very beneficial to all concerned.

Immigration is certainly needed in Wyoming, and is required to develop both our agricultural and industrial resources.

Yours, truly,

(Signed)

B. B. BROOKS,
Governor.

HEARING ON IMMIGRATION BILL.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1910.

The committee met at 10.30 o'clock a. m., Hon. Benjamin F. Howell in the chair.

Others present were Representatives Gardner, Bennet, Hayes, Küstermann, Edwards, Elvins, Moore (Texas), Sabath, and Goldfogle.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Mr. HAYES. I believe we have with us this morning some representatives of the Farmers' Union, who desire to be heard. I think that is the special order for this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. We shall be very glad to hear them.

STATEMENT OF T. J. BROOKS, REPRESENTING THE FARMERS' EDUCATIONAL AND COOPERATIVE UNION.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the other gentlemen here with me are F. D. Wimberly, of Georgia; A. C. Shuford, North Carolina; R. L. Barnett, Kentucky; and H. S. Mobly, Arkansas.

The gentleman whom we had expected to present our views, Mr. R. F. Duckworth, was called home by a telegram yesterday. There is sickness in his family, and it has been necessary for me to take his place. I have hastily gotten together my material with which to present our attitude. That being the case, if it is entirely satisfactory to the committee, I would ask that I be allowed to make a statement before I am asked any questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. BROOKS. But before I proceed if you want to know the extent of this organization and where it is located I will state that.

Mr. ELVINS. We shall be glad to hear it.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BROOKS. I will give you the list of States and Territories where we have organizations complete. I will have to call them from memory, and I will go over them in rotation as well as I can recall, them: Washington, Oregon, Idaho, California, New Mexico, Nebraska, Missouri, Kansas, Colorado, Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, and Louisiana. I am not sure whether I missed any.

Mr. ELVINS. What is the total membership, if you know?

Mr. BROOKS. I could not state definitely—

Mr. ELVINS. Approximately.

Mr. BROOKS. But the national president states that we have initiated 3,000,000 members.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Are most of the members from the Southern States?

Mr. BROOKS. Well, perhaps over half of the entire membership might be considered as coming from south of the center of the United States. I will now proceed.

At a hearing before this committee on February 22 last Mr. Holder read several of our resolutions, as a result of which a member of this committee said, according to the printed hearings:

Mr. Chairman, before Mr. Holder passes on I would like to say that my attention was called to one of the resolutions stating that, "Whereas the present flagrant lax enforcement of existing immigration laws" is one of the causes of this immigration that they protest against, I would like to ask Mr. Holder if it is possible for us to receive from this organization any definite details as to any flagrantly lax enforcement of the immigration laws. Let me ask you whether any member of the Farmers' Union, or has the organization itself, any letters of protest or information that would give us specific facts showing where there has been any flagrant laxity in the enforcement of the existing laws? And that a statement like that, if it is not so; certainly vitiates the whole resolution.

The matter was called to our attention by a message from Mr. Holder that the committee would hear us this morning. We quite agree with the opinion expressed, that if there was not reasonable ground for that part of our resolution the entire resolution would be more or less vitiated. Likewise we would respectfully submit that facts and expert opinions substantiating it vitalize the resolution.

In the first place, it must be remembered that that particular resolution was adopted September 3, 1908, and was not, of course, dealing with the present administration of our immigration laws or their administration by the present Secretary of Commerce and Labor, Hon. Charles Nagel. No such resolve is to be found in our resolutions adopted at Birmingham, Ala., last September, which I beg to read here for the purpose of showing that we felt laxness in enforcement had been remedied and for the further purpose of further showing the attitude of our organization toward the immigration problem:

Whereas the United States Immigration Commission will report to the next session of Congress recommending legislation; and

Whereas we are unalterably opposed to the present foreign influx from southeast Europe and western Asia, its proposed distribution and diversion to the South and West, and have in local, state, and national conventions resolved in favor of the enactment and vigorous enforcement of rigidly restrictive immigration laws: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Farmer's Educational and Cooperative Union of America in fifth annual convention assembled at Birmingham, Ala., this 9th day of September, 1909, representing more than 3,000,000 of farmers, reiterate and reaffirm the immigration resolutions adopted unanimously at Memphis January 8 and at Fort Worth September 3, 1908, calling upon our state, and particularly our federal, officials to exclude the present foreign influx by means of an increased head tax, a money test, the illiteracy test, and other effective measures; and be it further

Resolved, That the national legislative committee send copies of this and previous resolutions to the President for his annual message, to the Immigration Commission for its report, and to the Senate and House Immigration Committees for legislation, and to do all it possibly can to secure legislation along the lines of this and previous resolutions; and be it still further

Resolved, That the national secretary send copies of this resolution and previous ones to the various state secretaries with the request that the matter be taken up by locals with their Senators and Congressmen with a view to congressional action.

These resolutions do not criticise the present enforcement of our immigration laws, but really commend their vigorous enforcement and the enactment of an increased head tax, the illiteracy test, a money test, and other effective restrictive measures.

In regard to our reasons for believing that the immigration laws were not being enforced properly in 1908, we would submit an extract from an editorial published in a paper here in Washington, extracts from a brief left by New York state officials with President-elect Taft, some time before his inauguration, extracts from a statement given out to the press upon the appointment of Hon. William Williams as Mr. Watchorn's successor at Ellis Island, and certain statements made by two members of this committee upon the floor of the House during the administration of Mr. Nagel's predecessor.

Here is an article which was reprinted in the Farmers' Union News, of Union City, Ga., February 10, 1909, being copied from a monthly published here in Washington, called The Journal. I read only a few sentences from it.

Mr. SABATH. What is the name of the paper?

Mr. BROOKS. The Journal.

Mr. BENNET. There is no such paper in Washington.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. That must be a mistake.

Mr. BROOKS. It was copied from a journal. This clipping was taken from the Union City News. This is not the original.

Mr. HAYES. Perhaps the Wilmington Journal.

Mr. BROOKS. This [exhibiting copy] is the paper I got it out of—the Farmers' Union News.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. You ought to give credit to the original paper.

Mr. BROOKS. I will read it:

Mr. Straus succeeded Mr. Metcalf as Secretary of Commerce and Labor on December 17, 1906, and immediately proceeded, in the face of a continued deterioration in the quality and character of immigration, to reduce the percentage debarred during the next six months from 1.3 per cent, which it was under Metcalf during the previous six months, to 0.8 per cent reduction, or rather breaking down in the administration of the law of over 38 per cent.

One need only visit New York or Boston to get an idea of what is beginning to take place. A talk with any of the old immigration officials will readily convince the interviewer of the scandalous relaxation that has taken place since December 17, 1906. The inspectors, members of the boards of special inquiry, and other officials will tell you how they have had to respond to the subtle but unmistakable signs from the Secretary's office at Washington.

Mr. SABATH. That is an article purporting to have been copied from some other paper that is not in existence; is that right?

Mr. HAYES. I would suggest that it is probably the Washington State Journal.

Mr. J. H. PATTEN. I believe there is a paper published here called "The Journal," with an alleged circulation of 100,000.

Mr. SABATH. In this city?

Mr. J. H. PATTEN. Yes, sir; I have seen it. I think John W. Hayes is editor.

Mr. C. S. ATKINSON. It is a labor paper.

Mr. J. H. PATTEN. I believe it is the Knights of Labor Journal. I am sure I can get a copy in five minutes, if you wish to have it.

Mr. BROOKS. It was credited to a paper of that name, and that is all I know about it.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I assume you are simply reading from the clipping.

Mr. BROOKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. You are not stating your own views with regard to Secretary Straus?

Mr. BROOKS. No, sir.

I have here the copy of a brief left with President-elect W. H. Taft, on January 20, 1909, at Augusta, Ga., by two New York state officials, Dr. Albert Warren Ferris, president of the state commission in lunacy, and Dr. Sidney D. Wilgus, chairman of the New York state board of alienists, both of whom were sent there by their respective state bodies to protest against the lax enforcement of the provision in our immigration laws debarring certain insane aliens.

Among other things, the brief says that they believe that "the immigration laws of 1907 are ample and adequate" to debar the insane, "if properly enforced according to their terms." The brief complains of Secretary Straus "stretching" the law and admitting insane aliens under bond. It states that "if the Secretary held a brief for the defective, diseased, and insane aliens he could not have devised a more specious argument to nullify the immigration laws than appears in decision 116, issued October 12, 1908;" says that "New York State is no longer willing to receive the insane he is landing through executive clemency or on worthless bonds;" and that "we regard the Secretary as prejudiced, unreasonable, and dangerous."

I have that brief here in full.

Mr. SABATH. From whose brief are you reading now?

Mr. BROOKS. It is right here in full.

Mr. SABATH. Prepared by whom?

Mr. BROOKS. It is a copy of a brief left with Judge Taft, at Augusta, Ga., on January 20, 1909, by the New York authorities I quoted. The committee was sent down there by their respective boards for that purpose.

On the 18th of last May (1909), the resignation of Robert Watchorn, as commissioner of immigration at New York City, according to the official White House statement, "was accepted for the good of the service," although there have been interested in his retention a number of good people who did not understand the facts in respect to the condition of the office."

Mr. BENNET. What Member of the House is that?

Mr. BROOKS. I am not quoting a Member of the House now.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. You referred to decisions 116 and 117 of the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor. Did you quote from those decisions, or have you quoted from some one else?

Mr. BROOKS. I was quoting from comments on those decisions.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman should be allowed to make his statement without being interrupted further.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I would like to get my mind clear on the statement as he goes along, although I am very anxious to hear the gentleman.

Mr. BROOKS. I shall proceed.

The statement also said that Mr. Watchorn's "administration of the office proved to be unsatisfactory to the President and the Secretary of Commerce and Labor," and that "the President and the secretary (Mr. Nagel) were anxious to have the office administered

with a single view to its efficiency in the enforcement of the immigration laws."

Now, here is a quotation from the Congressional Record of February 25, 1909. A Member of the House and of this committee said:

Not only has there been of late great laxity and indifference on the part of the Department of Commerce and Labor in the deportation of Chinese unlawfully in this country, but the same spirit has pervaded the whole administration of the law.

A gentleman connected with the Chinese service, and well up in the service, too, told me not long ago, and I have no doubt that he is correct, that he believes that 500 Chinamen are here in the city of Washington in violation of the law, and yet he says:

"I am not allowed to make any move to discover these men, nor to arrest or deport them."

The only thing that seems to have been done about it (conditions reported to Secretary Straus by Professor Jenks in 1907) was that the honest inspector who gave Jenks his information was shorn of his credentials and transferred, and the dishonest employee retained, just as Doctor Salmon was transferred from Ellis Island in the fall of 1906 for giving J. B. Reynolds information.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Give the Member's name.

Mr. BROOKS. I suppose the gentleman recognizes his own words and might acknowledge them.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. He may not be present.

Mr. BROOKS. I think he is present.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Read further.

Mr. EDWARDS. It is no secret if it is printed in the Congressional Record.

Mr. BROOKS. I think it was Mr. Burnett.

Mr. HAYES. He is not here.

Mr. BROOKS. Well, I am not acquainted with each one of you gentlemen. I will commence again.

Not only has there been of late great laxity and indifference on the part of the Department of Commerce and Labor in the deportation of Chinese unlawfully in this country, but the same spirit has pervaded the whole administration of the law.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Who said that?

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Burnett, I think.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Can you give the date of the speech?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes; February 25, 1909.

A gentleman connected with the Chinese service, and well up in the service, too, told me not long ago, and I have no doubt that he is correct, that he believes that 500 Chinamen are here in the city of Washington in violation of the law, and yet he says:

"I am not allowed to make any move to discover these men, nor to arrest or deport them."

The only thing that seems to have been done about it (conditions reported to Secretary Straus by Professor Jenks in 1907) was that the honest inspector who gave Jenks his information was shorn of his credentials and transferred, and the dishonest employee retained, just as Doctor Salmon was transferred from Ellis Island in the fall of 1906 for giving J. B. Reynolds information.

Mr. BROOKS. I took these statements hastily, and, as I said, I did not expect to appear before you. Mr. Duckworth was to perform this service. That is all I wish to say on that subject.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as considerable discussion has been had on the necessity for immigration in the Southern States, and being from the South myself I would like to make some observations along that line.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. What State are you from?

Mr. BROOKS. Tennessee.

Mr. ELVINS. Before you proceed, do I understand that what you have been reading here is simply offered here for the purpose of showing that your association had a reason for adopting the resolution?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes, sir; and that we are not charging the same now, as our last resolutions of the national convention did not make those charges.

Mr. SABATH. So you believe the laws are now being strictly enforced?

Mr. BROOKS. So far as I know, they are being properly enforced; but my intimate knowledge is not sufficient to bank on.

Mr. BENNET. I would like to ask in what respect the administration of the laws under Secretary Straus differed from the administration of the laws under Secretary Nagle.

Mr. BROOKS. I do not know that I could answer your question exactly.

Mr. BENNET. You say that your organization at one time adopted a resolution criticising the laws as they were administered by Secretary Straus?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BENNET. But at your last annual convention you not only did not adopt such a resolution, but approved the administration of the laws as being carried on under Secretary Nagle? I think it would interest the committee—it certainly would me—to know what the evidence was on which you based your statement that there is a difference in the administration of the laws now and as it was administered by Secretary Nagle, and what the difference is.

Mr. BROOKS. Well, the percentage has been strikingly increased of those who were rejected. That stands upon its face as one kind of evidence.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Assuming the fact to be so, would that be evidence of a lax administration of the law?

Mr. BROOKS. And we see no complaint here as to the nonenforcement of the law. Those complaints were current then in Congress and out of it, and through the press generally, and now we do not see such complaints.

Mr. BENNET. Was your body aware at that time that in the last year of Secretary Metcalf's administration there were 925 aliens ordered deported, and in the first year of Secretary Straus's administration there were 1,955—an increase of over 100 per cent in the deportation?

Mr. BROOKS. Well, perhaps the increases in deportations were greater, and yet the percentage of rejections might not have been as great.

Mr. BENNET. It has been practically the same in the last five years, under all administrations—a trifle over or under 100 per cent.

Mr. BROOKS. Well, have not the rejections been increased since Mr. Straus went out of office, and since his successor took his place?

Mr. BENNET. I would not want to say so, because we have not any report that divides the fiscal year into two parts.

Mr. SABATH. I think it has increased, because a great many people are rejected that ought not to be rejected, and they are rejected without any warrant of law on the part of our present officials.

Mr. BROOKS. Of course, the law should be enforced, but it should not be overstepped one way or the other.

Mr. BENNET. Well, I agree with you.

Mr. BROOKS. I am not in a position to substantiate your position. Of course, my knowledge is not intimate enough for that.

Mr. EDWARDS. Anyhow, your organization passed the resolution which it did, calling for a more strict enforcement of the law, based upon the newspaper reports and expressions contained in speeches of Members of Congress which you have submitted here; and those criticisms not existing now, and not appearing in the daily press, lead your organization to believe that the law is being more strictly enforced, and you are, therefore, so far as your information goes, better satisfied with the present administration?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes, sir; you have stated it fairly.

Mr. BENNET. Were you aware when that resolution was adopted that these charges against Doctor Ferris and Doctor Wilgus, both from my State, New York, had been brought to the attention of President Roosevelt, and involved but three cases, none of which had been passed upon by Secretary Straus, and that President Roosevelt sustained the Department of Commerce and Labor in every way?

Mr. BROOKS. Well, that might be the case and still not prove anything. Of course, an isolated case might be wrongfully rejected or wrongfully admitted, but the general trend of affairs would have more to do with it than an isolated case.

Mr. BENNET. The charges only covered three cases, as to all of which I have read every line, and none of which was passed on by Secretary Straus.

Mr. HAYES. Is it not generally understood that the administration of the law is more strictly enforced at present than it has been for some years?

Mr. BENNET. At the particular moment I would not say it was. There was a time when they had a former Assistant Secretary, since Mr. Straus went out, when the law was rigorously enforced. Families were separated, and I agree with Mr. Sabath that the spirit of the law was violated absolutely.

Mr. ELVINS. Is it being violated now?

Mr. BENNET. At the present time I think it is being administered according to the spirit and intent of the law. I agree with this gentleman that there is no reasonable cause for any criticism whatever of the present administration of the law.

Mr. HAYES. There was plenty of it before. It came to my personal knowledge.

Mr. SABATH. It is coming to my knowledge now that the law is being violated by families being separated and being rejected without any warrant of law. I have several cases now that I desire to bring before this committee at the first opportunity that presents itself.

Mr. EDWARDS. I think the gentleman ought to be permitted to proceed with his statement.

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. BROOKS. To resume my discussion of the attitude of the organizations in my section of the country on immigration—we are organized in the 29 States I have just named—but I am speaking now of the attitude of the Southern States, in particular, because it is there it is proposed to divert and distribute immigrants.

We feel confident that in this matter of the substantial and material restriction of the present enormous foreign immigration we also

voice the sentiments of the people generally in the agricultural States and Territories of the South and West.

In support of that opinion, we beg to cite a few typical resolutions and the actions of a number of southern state legislatures, and the results and conclusions of such a canvass as was made several years ago by such a leading trade paper as the *Manufacturers' Record*, of Baltimore, Md.

For some time certain land speculators, large employers, transportation lines, and apparently foreign interests have been endeavoring to divert, distribute, and direct foreign immigration, particularly, to the South. One phase of this agitation has taken the turn of establishing a southern commercial congress here in Washington, and the proposal to build opposite the Shoreham Hotel, on Fifteenth street, a million-dollar building for "A greater nation through a greater South," i. e., the immediate development of all its resources by the means of immigration. The project is in the hands of a foreign-born gentleman who spent but one year in the South. Last winter banquet after banquet was held at the New Willard, and there seemed to be no end to the funds available for the purpose. The *Manufacturers' Record*, of Baltimore, the leading trade paper of the country, in commenting on this and similar other enterprises said editorially in its issue of March 4, 1909:

We have in our archives complete records of every one of these attempts made during the last ten years. It appears from these records that there is almost something more than mere coincidence in the means adopted and even in the language employed in trying to persuade representative southern men to give them countenance.

A later gathering, into which an utterly alien element dominantly but in cloak entered, over which a southern governor presided and which also became "permanent," was, from the earnest standpoint of the southern men concerned in it, for the benefit of the South. But it was in reality the outcome of a plan originating in Italy to flood the South with Sicilians. That plan in that form was successfully combated by the *Manufacturers' Record*, but it emerged again under another form in another "permanent southern organization," with another southern governor as president, but with a trans-Atlantic steamship company engaged in transporting immigrants from southern Europe as apparently the chief beneficiary had the scheme developed. Biding their time for another venture whenever the South might be off its guard as to immigration, the actual promoters in this country of both these "southern" undertakings which had deceived representative southern men were found joining hands in an organization in New York designed to blind the eyes of this country to the evils reeking in immigration from southern Europe, of the kind being sent to this country, and to make the National Government an unwitting party to the scheme to turn the noxious flood into the South.

The *Manufacturers' Record* knows that representative Southerners would be astonished to learn how close they have come in southern gatherings of various kinds with the witting or unwitting agents of these alien-fostered immigration schemes directed against the South and its best interests. But immigration has been but one of the schemes for the ostensible benefit of the South which in the past ten years have lived their little day as long as financial support, usually by the way of New York, has been maintained.

At the risk of losing long-time friendships and of being misunderstood as criticising public officials and business men of the South in our disinterested efforts to prevent them from being committed to mistakes for the South, the *Manufacturers' Record* has never hesitated to call attention to the chances for mistakes in all these movements. We know that deliberate misrepresentation of us has been made by the real promoters, but seldom coming into the open, of the movements, which in later years have been largely different phases merely of the same movement, but we have been content to rest upon the conviction that time will prove the wisdom and good intent of our advice.

Another phase of this same effort has been the endeavor to have the States of the South and West establish state immigration bureaus.

States like Florida, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Texas, Arkansas, and Tennessee have repeatedly refused to induce even "desirable immigration," although their legislatures have been annually urged to by certain interests. Virginia and North Carolina were persuaded to appropriate money for such purposes, but have discontinued them. Two years ago last month the Virginia assembly adopted the following resolution:

Resolved by the senate of Virginia (the house of delegates concurring), That our Representatives in both Houses of Congress be, and they are hereby, requested to oppose in every possible manner the influx into Virginia of immigrants from southern Europe, with their Mafia and Black Hand and murder societies, and with no characteristics to make them with us a homogeneous people. Believing as we do that upon Anglo-Saxon supremacy depends the future welfare and prosperity of this Commonwealth, we view with alarm any effort that may tend to corrupt its citizenship.

North Carolina, through its bureau of labor, in 1906, made a very thorough and careful canvass of the wishes and need for immigration and found an overwhelming opposition to the inducement or distribution and diversion of the present foreign immigration to that State. The results are published in the Twenty-seventh Annual Report of the Bureau of Labor, and take up 284 pages of that report.

A few years ago South Carolina established a state bureau of immigration, appropriated considerable money, and with a fund generously contributed to by certain cotton-mill men, real-estate speculators, and others peculiarly interested, its commissioner of immigration went abroad and brought two cargoes of immigrants to South Carolina, distributing and finding places for each one of the 762 in various parts of the State. To make a long story short, on the 4th day of March, 1909, an act was approved abolishing the bureau of immigration and forbidding a state official "to attempt directly or indirectly to bring immigrants into the State of South Carolina."

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Can you tell us where those 700 immigrants came from? I understood they were Belgians.

Mr. BENNET. They were Belgians.

Mr. BROOKS. Yes; Belgians.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. They were not from the south of Europe.

Mr. BROOKS. No; they were from the north of Europe.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. You were speaking of undesirable immigrants.

Mr. BROOKS. I think they would have been still more undesirable if they had been from the south of Europe instead of from Belgium.

Mr. SABATH. That depends upon the representations made to them at the time they were induced to immigrate.

Mr. BENNET. They were undesirable largely because they did not stay in South Carolina?

Mr. BROOKS. It seems that South Carolina was undesirable to them, and it was mutual. [Laughter.]

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I think that is the reason.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Don't you personally, as a rule, regard immigration from Belgium as being fairly desirable?

Mr. BROOKS. Taken as a general principle, any of the people from northwestern Europe—the average citizen of those countries is more desirable.

Such action on the part of South Carolina is typical not only of the attitude of the southern legislatures, but of other less official assemblages, frequently gotten up as immigration "conferences" and "con-

ventions." I have in mind four recent state and interstate immigration meetings of this character, really initiated and promoted by the same interests, which in spite of the promoters adopted restrictive resolutions. The Alabama Immigration Conference, held at Birmingham, Ala., June 13, 1905, adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That we express to the Representatives in the Federal Congress from this State our earnest desire that they support any reasonable measure looking to the elevation of the standard of foreign immigration, to the end that criminals, paupers, and illiterates be excluded.

That conference was called for boosting immigration. The transportation and real-estate interests were there in full force.

The famous Chattanooga Conference on Immigration and Quarantine was a similar gathering, but indorsed President Roosevelt's messages on the subject, one of which, at least, I understand, argued strongly for an economic test and the educational or "literacy" test. There was a similar outcome to the Nashville conference of November, 1907.

The last effort was made at Tampa, Fla., where a convention of various persons from many States and representing different societies, commercial clubs, unions, associations, corporations, railroads, and the like, met February 13, 1908; and a number of resolutions were adopted, among which is to be found the following:

Resolved, That the several States carefully consider the question of foreign immigration as a national question, and that our Representatives in Congress be asked to urge upon Congress the enactment of such federal legislation as will effectively stem the tide of undesirable immigration now pouring into this country through the great ports of entry, and such laws as will look to the careful examination of applicants or admission at the ports of departure.

My attention has been called to the symposium, incorporated March 1 in your hearings, of 93 letters secured from parties three years ago in 36 States, in answer to a letter sent out by the New York City National Board of Trade. Three carefully worded questions seem to have been asked in that letter.

There is nothing to indicate the number of letters sent out. Only 17 governors seem to have answered the letters in person or through a secretary or some state bureau. Over one-fourth of the replies are from railroads, and the other letters come principally from mayors, commercial clubs, and real estate men. The origin of the symposium and the source of the replies would seem to corroborate my statement that the only demand for foreign immigration throughout the agricultural districts of the South and West comes really from the transportation interests, that wish to develop traffic; real estate boomers, hoping to sell land thereby; the large employers, always demanding cheaper labor, and certain other financial and gambling interests, anxious to prevent the farmers properly controlling the production and marketing of their crops sufficiently to secure a fair and reasonable price.

According to the letters from South Carolina and Georgia, for instance, the National Board of Trade of New York City would have this committee believe that those two States were in favor of not only the present foreign immigration, but its distribution and diversion to those States.

There are two replies from South Carolina, one from former Mayor Rhett, of Charleston, and the other from former Commissioner of Immigration and Agriculture E. J. Watson. As I have pointed out,

Mr. Watson's office has been abolished by the state legislature of South Carolina, which affirmatively forbade a state official "to attempt directly or indirectly to bring immigrants into" that State. Mr. Rhett ran against Mr. Smith for the United States Senate just one year after he wrote the letter quoted, on just such a platform, while Mr. Smith stood for the abolition of the Immigration Bureau and for rigid restriction of foreign immigration. It was fought out in joint debate in every county, Mr. Rhett favoring "the restriction of undesirables." Mr. Smith received in the second primary the largest majority ever received by any senatorial candidate in South Carolina, Mr. Rhett having been eliminated in the first primary.

With regard to the replies from Georgia, it is to be noted that three are from railroads and two from chambers of commerce, which are, as a rule, controlled by the real estate and transportation interests. There is no reply from Governor Hoke Smith, although he went abroad that summer to investigate the matter, began to support it, and as a result, although out on the stump every day of the campaign, was denied a reelection by the people of Georgia largely because of that trip abroad; the present governor being elected without making a single campaign speech.

In both of these States the matter of restriction has really been a live campaign issue since these letters, published in the National Board of Trade Symposium, were written, and the popular verdict has been overwhelmingly in opposition to foreign immigration.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. One moment. Decisions 116 and 117 have been referred to on this hearing and on previous hearings, and many misstatements concerning those decisions have been made, and much misconstruction placed upon them. So that we might have clearly before us the crux of the two decisions, I wish to call attention to them now. It may save considerable misstatement and misconstruction hereafter.

In decision No. 116 of Secretary Straus, dated September 28, 1908, it is stated:

At the hearing—

That is, the hearing of the case upon which the decision is based—

At the hearing, however, it has developed that the person so certified is not coming to the United States with the intention of remaining or of mingling with the body of the people, but solely for the purpose of receiving medical treatment at some sanitarium or health resort in the United States, and of departing from the United States at the conclusion of such treatment and after only a temporary stay therein.

Then, after the matter had been argued out by the Secretary in this decision No. 116, the Secretary proceeds to say:

With all the foregoing considerations in mind, and having in view the special facts and circumstances of the several specific cases of the character hereinbefore described which have arisen on the Canadian border, the department has been constrained—

The Secretary referred in this decision to the cases decided by the Supreme Court of the United States, and quoted from those decisions. He says:

The department has been constrained to hold that the particular persons involved were not "aliens" of the kind intended to be reached by the immigration law, nor comprehended in the enumeration of classes excluded thereby, and to permit, under conditions stated in each case (to insure their eventual departure, to provide against possible contagion, and to save the community from expense) the temporary admission

of such foreigners, who were merely seeking an opportunity to recover their health in some place or at the hands of some person in the United States. To have done less would, in its opinion, have constituted a failure to properly exercise the broad, practical discretion necessarily vested in a great executive department of the Government charged with the administration of so comprehensive a statute as the immigration act.

I now turn to Decision No. 117, dated December 1, 1908, made by Secretary Straus, and in it the Secretary says:

It having been repeatedly held by the courts that an alien who has in good faith acquired a permanent domicile in the United States is not precluded by anything in the immigration laws from returning thereto after a temporary absence abroad, the department has, of course, governed itself accordingly, reserving, however, the necessary discretion and authority to determine in particular cases as they arise whether an alien seeking admission to the United States on the ground of former domicile shall be permitted to enter. To entitle an alien to admission on said ground it must appear that the domicile acquired was a permanent one, and has not been abandoned. This is a question of fact to be determined finally by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor. An alien may have made frequent visits to the United States, and may have previously resided therein for a considerable period of time, but may nevertheless be liable to exclusion.

So that, you see, there has been much misstatement concerning decisions Nos. 116 and 117, and evidently the gentlemen who appeared here—no doubt in good faith—have misconstrued decisions 116 and 117.

Mr. BROOKS. I was quoting from a construction placed on them by others—that is, New York state officials, for instance—who spoke from their experience, I suppose.

Mr. HAYES. It is not necessary to put them in the record.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I prefer that so much of them as I have read be printed in the record, to preserve the continuity of them.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, it is found that the great percentage of these immigrants come over here and stay a short while, and then return home with their savings. I believe it is claimed that 40 per cent do return, and that shows that they are not the kind of citizens upon which you can build a permanent republican form of government, coming, as they do, from the countries where their surroundings are so different from ours. That is an unfortunate phase of the question, and another unfortunate phase is that in case these citizens do not come up to the requirements of citizenship of a Republic like this, they are really a greater hindrance to us if they stay here than if they return.

Every condition is a prophecy of something that is to follow. It can not be otherwise, and it is in the purview of statesmanship to interpret the effect of conditions. A condition once existed in France that was a prophecy of the reign of terror, but its statesmen did not see it. A condition once existed in England that was a prophecy of Cromwell, but the statesmen of England did not see it. The laws passed by Parliament at one time were a prophecy of Cornwallis handing his sword to Washington, but they did not see it. Every slave ship fanned across the Atlantic Ocean was a prophecy of Sherman's march to the sea, but the people of that day did not realize it, did not see it.

Now, if this enormous undesirable immigration continues, and if it is really undesirable, as the Commissioner-General says in his last annual report, from the standpoint of American citizenship, it is a prophecy of something that will follow that is certainly appalling to contemplate.

There is such a thing as a people being unable to maintain the civilization that is handed down to them. The Indian was unable to sustain the civilization the white man presented to him in this country. The negro was transplanted from Africa here into the bosom of civilization, and he will be unable to sustain that civilization, should he be admitted to full citizenship and equality in the South with the white man. He would be a hindrance to the South, and nobody denies it.

Now, it is absolutely unfortunate that these things are true. Perhaps we feel that we are encroaching upon a sentiment in denying the immigration of anybody that wants to come here, because our ancestors came here from somewhere, and, of course, lots of good men are not born in this country. Jesus Christ, for instance. But that does not——

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Some members of the committee, for instance. [Laughter.]

Mr. SABATH. You do not have to go that far back.

Mr. BROOKS. And I assure you that our organization and the farmers generally would be as far as anybody from wanting to restrict immigration if that immigration was voluntary and came up to all the requirements of the standard of citizenship required in this Government. It is our patriotism to mankind and to our country that makes us enter our protest against this immigration from southeast Europe, western Asia, and the apparently least desirable citizens of other parts of the world. I do not know all the powers that are behind the movement that has shifted our foreign immigration continually to the less desirable to that which is so different from us. I will not take your time to give my views further on it, even; but we know it has been done; the Commissioner-General says so, and we are simply presenting to you the attitude of our organization that has been repeated year by year in its conventions.

I believe I have no further remarks to make, unless you have some questions.

Mr. SABATH. You seem to be well posted. Will you permit me to ask you one question?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SABATH. You claim there is no objection to certain immigration. You divide immigration into the desirable and undesirable classes, and you say that there is no objection to the desirable immigration. Is it not a fact that about forty or fifty years ago the same objection was made, as being undesirable immigration, to what is now called desirable immigration? Were not the same questions and the same objections raised to them as being undesirable immigrants?

Mr. BROOKS. I think the immigration that was protested against then was quite different from the kind of immigration that we are protesting against now. And, then, conditions are quite different in this country——

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Was it not then called "undesirable?"

Mr. BROOKS. I did not live then.

Mr. SABATH. You go back and tell about France and England and other countries. You seem to know something about history. This is not such a long way off.

Mr. BROOKS. I think, at least, that if this immigration which is coming now were coming then the protest made against it would

have been much more pronounced and effective than it was, and there would have been far better grounds for it, to say the least.

Mr. SABATH. So you admit that there were no good grounds for objecting to the immigration then?

Mr. BROOKS. No; I do not think that at all. Why not say there were not as good grounds as we now have?

Mr. ELVINS. You think the Know-Nothing party would have been more successful in those days if the immigration had been as bad then as it is now?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes, sir; if you want to use that term.

Mr. SABATH. Are you really acquainted with the present immigration; have you any in your own State?

Mr. BROOKS. We have enough, thank God.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. What State are you from?

Mr. BROOKS. Tennessee.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. When you say, "Thank God," you mean you are glad you have them?

Mr. BROOKS. We are glad we do not have any more.

Mr. SABATH. What immigration do you object to, what country?

Mr. BROOKS. Well, it is the quality of citizens, not the country; but, of course, certain countries furnish a much greater percentage of undesirables than others.

Mr. SABATH. Can you give us the countries that furnish those?

Mr. BROOKS. The Sicilian, the southern Italian, the Greek, the Syrian, and some from that belt of Africa and Asia surrounding the Mediterranean Sea, and farther east, including all Mongolians and Hindus.

Mr. SABATH. Those are the people you most object to?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Can you tell us why you object to those?

Mr. BROOKS. We do not think they are qualified. Their standards and ideals are totally different.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Don't they eat enough, or don't they live high enough, or don't they behave well?

Mr. BROOKS. We do not think they come up to the standards or requirements for citizenship in this country.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. That is a generality.

Mr. SABATH. Some of these people had a high grade of civilization long before this country was ever dreamt of.

Mr. BROOKS. Yes; but the policy which they pursued in conquering inferior people and bringing them home as slaves and later allowing them to enter into their citizenship caused the better element to be submerged.

Mr. SABATH. We have been doing a little conquering ourselves of late, have we not?

Mr. BENNET. Would you bar out the Armenian Christians who are being massacred?

Mr. BROOKS. Well, that is rather a sentimental question.

Mr. BENNET. No; it is a practical question.

Mr. BROOKS. It all depends on what class they come under. The laws as passed and executed would determine that, when they came here.

Mr. BENNET. That is quite an answer.

Mr. GARDNER. Would you object to our passing a special act which would admit people who are suffering from religious persecution?

Mr. BROOKS. I do not know as to the difficulty of that kind of a law. It might be abused, and it might be necessary, in a special case.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts to the fact that an amendment to a bill having in view the proposition of the gentleman from Massachusetts referred to was offered in the House and advocated and supported by me on the floor, and was adopted by the Committee of the Whole, but by a bare majority.

Mr. GARDNER. I think I voted for one of those amendments.

Mr. BROOKS. If that is all, I thank you very heartily.

Mr. BENNET. You did not give us your office in the union.

Mr. BROOKS. I am at present a member of the national legislative committee of the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union.

Mr. BENNET. I would like to ask you the direct question, Is it a fact that the negro vote is suppressed in the South, as you stated?

Mr. BROOKS. The negro vote in the South is a subject that you people in Congress can thrash out.

Mr. BENNET. You referred to that subject, or else I would not have brought it up.

Mr. SABATH. You mentioned that the majority of your members are in the Southern States. There are also a large number of other States in which you have membership—Washington and Western States—are there not?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SABATH. Is Kansas one of the States you have mentioned?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SABATH. And a few others?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SABATH. Washington and Oregon and several others?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SABATH. So it is not only a few Southern States that are members of this organization?

Mr. BROOKS. Oh, no.

Mr. HAYES. You have a very large membership in my own county in California.

Mr. BROOKS. I have a statement here referring to the sentiment in that part of the country, if you wish to put it in the record.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Have you come to the conclusion in your own mind that an illiterate person is a bad person?

Mr. BROOKS. Not necessarily and invariably by itself, without anything else to be considered, but an illiterate person is on the average less able to discharge his duty as a citizen here than a man who can read and write.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Can he not do his work as well?

Mr. BROOKS. It is not altogether a question of work. Man does not live by bread alone. A mule is a serviceable animal, but you can have too many of them.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I hope you will not compare them with a mule.

Mr. BROOKS. I am not meaning any reflection at all; but it is not simply and solely a question of work.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Is it not because you want to find some way of restricting immigration to a greater extent; is it not thrown up just

for that purpose? Could you not just as well ask us to keep out all the people who are red haired and have freckles in their faces as being undesirable, because if you read novels you will always find the villain with red hair?

Mr. BROOKS. I suppose the gentleman intended his suggestion to be humorous——

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Brooks, I would like to ask whether this organization, known as the Farmers' Union, representing something like a membership of 3,000,000, and extending from the great Northwest all through the central part of the United States and the Southern States, is not in favor of loosening up on the immigration laws, and does not see any great need for a distribution of these immigrants through this section of the territory as represented by your organization?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes, sir. They do not desire foreign immigration.

Mr. EDWARDS. You do not consider that the farming industry and the other industries of these great States are in such need of more labor that they should establish these agencies for the distribution of these immigrants?

Mr. BROOKS. No, sir.

Mr. EDWARDS. And these representations that have been made to that effect you do not consider as fair representations of the desires and needs of these great States?

Mr. BROOKS. I am quite sure of it, from intimate association with farm organizations throughout the country. We have never had a protest against our resolutions on the subject from any State.

Mr. BENNET. I did not catch the last sentence.

Mr. BROOKS. I say we do not have any protests at all against restrictive resolutions passed from anyone in any State where it has been offered.

Mr. BENNET. It has been often said through the press and in other ways that because of the high prices of farm products consequently the high cost of living is, to some extent, at least, brought about by the scarcity of farm labor, by reason of the fact that the farmers can not get sufficient labor to enable them to cultivate the farms and to produce the agricultural products, and your organization does not find that to be the case?

Mr. BROOKS. We do not find it to be the case. As it is, we find it hard to keep our own people on the farms. The necessity for their being there is not great enough to keep them there, and they are drifting to the cities and towns.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Especially are they coming over to our city of New York.

Mr. BROOKS. Not much of this foreign immigration seems to want to go to the country when it comes. If it does take the place of our laborers, they generally drift to somewhere else, even over the border into Canada. That shows that they do not fill a place that needs them, but they cause others to leave.

As to the South and the North, the North having absorbed the greater part of this immigration, I have some figures here which might be looked upon as egotistical, being a southern man, giving the population and growth and industrial development of the South and the North since 1860, and I will ask to have them copied in the record.

This, taken from the *Tradesman* (Chattanooga, Tenn.), one of the leading trade papers of the South, shows that the South has not suffered from its lack of foreign immigrants—their not going there to any large extent—and that in population, labor supply, out of its own loins, bank deposits, railroad mileage, and in every material and commercial way, the South has increased at a faster percentage than the North with all its influx of aliens, where there is race suicide, etc.

	United States in 1860	South in 1900.
Population.....	31,000,000	25,000,000
Bank deposits.....	\$253,000,000	\$745,000,000
Railroad mileage.....	30,000	62,000
Coal production, in tons.....	15,173,000	67,700,000
Pig iron, in tons.....	884,474	2,743,000
Exports.....	\$333,570,000	\$557,242,000
Cotton spindles.....	5,035,000	8,615,000
Valuation of property.....	\$16,139,000,000	\$15,500,000,000

The 18 Southern States and Territories have received practically no foreign immigrants during the last fifty years, only a few hundred going to each State or Territory; still its total population, either white or black, or both, has increased at over 30 per cent per decade, while the population of the North, the labor supply, has not increased quite as fast. The native birth rate in the Northeastern States, where the bulk, about three-fourths, of the present alien influx settles or is destined, has fallen off until it almost equals the death rate in some localities—race suicide. Forty per cent of the present influx of aliens goes back within a few years with its savings; three-fourths of it is male adults, unmarried, and does not come back again after returning to its native lands, as is shown by official statistics, which show that only about one-tenth of the number that comes has ever been here before.

Mr. BENNET. Nobody denies that the industrial development of the South has been tremendous. I am a northern man myself, but everyone knows that fact.

Mr. HAYES. You were speaking of the need of agricultural laborers in the South. Are you personally acquainted with any case where any of the farm products of the South, like cotton, has perished or been destroyed because there has been no labor to harvest it?

Mr. BROOKE. No, sir. The crops are all gathered, so far as I am acquainted with the facts. Of course it may be that an unusual storm will delay the picking of cotton a while, but it will be gathered eventually, and that periodic short seasonal demand for labor could not be supplied by immigration. It could not come and go every fall, and it would not be desirable if it could, and if they stayed there and raised more cotton they would be in the same fix that we are in. The demand for it is mostly in the papers.

Mr. SABATH. So you do not depend very much on the articles that you see in the papers from time to time about the scarcity of labor in the South?

Mr. BROOKS. As to this, I am sure it is exaggerated greatly.

Mr. EDWARDS. Right there; your organization is composed of employers; that is, the individual members of your organization are many of them employers of labor?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. EDWARDS. Being farmers, they have to employ more or less labor?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. EDWARDS. And you find no scarcity?

Mr. BROOKS. No, sir; we do not find a scarcity. If we did we would make a different record in our proceedings.

Mr. BENNET. If you do not rely on newspaper articles in that regard, why do you read before our committee, as evidence, certain articles from newspapers in relation to an alleged laxity in the administration of the immigration laws?

Mr. BROOKS. Well, those articles purport to be quotations from government officials, and I simply offered them. I hated to take up the time on that subject, but I wanted to show why those references were in the resolution.

Mr. BENNET. You do not, then, indorse from your own knowledge, any of the statements in those papers?

Mr. BROOKS. So far as my own personal, intimate knowledge of the facts is concerned, I do not, because I am not stationed at any of those places.

Mr. GARDNER. I am entirely in favor of your position, but, in justice to our immigration officials, I believe that they are most careful in enforcing the law, and they are most excellently enforcing the law, with the exception of the laws relating to Mongolian immigration, which are enforced as well as they can be enforced, considering the vast extent of our borders. Although I am entirely in sympathy with your position on the main question, I think you are wrong on that question.

Mr. BENNET. You said something about bringing illiterates into our citizenship. Are you aware of the fact that since the 29th of June, 1906, when the naturalization statute was passed, no one can be admitted to citizenship who can not sign his name in English?

Mr. SABATH. They must speak the English language.

Mr. BENNET. Yes; and must be able to write his name in English; so that no illiterate can now become a citizen of the United States.

Mr. BROOKS. Well, I can only repeat that if the requirements that are now made are not sufficient for the restriction, we simply want more.

Mr. BENNET. I am not talking about the restriction at all; I am talking about citizenship, which is an entirely different thing. You were not aware that there was such a statute, were you?

Mr. BROOKS. I do not know that I knew of the particular act you refer to.

Mr. BENNET. Or of the requirement?

Mr. HAYES. The gentleman from New York is referring to the naturalization law, not immigration. A man can not be naturalized unless he can speak English.

Mr. BROOKS. Oh, I see the point. Well, it is rather unfortunate for a man to emigrate to a country where he can not be naturalized.

Mr. EDWARDS. It would be unfortunate for the country, too, if we would admit a lot of people here whom we can not naturalize.

Mr. BENNET. That presents another question. I will ask him if he knows that statistics show that 25 per cent of the aliens admitted to this country can not read or write, and that when these people

present themselves for citizenship, the illiteracy decreases between the time of the filing of the declaration and the time of admission to citizenship, over 50 per cent, over half.

Mr. BROOKS. I do not really see that there is much in that. Of course it does not take a man that has any sense at all a long time to learn how to sign his name.

Mr. BENNET. I am not talking about signing his name; I am talking about illiteracy.

Mr. BROOKS. I look upon that as merely an incidental part of this question.

Mr. BENNET. Don't you think we ought to take into consideration, in considering the so-called illiteracy test, the fact, if it is a fact, that in some of the countries from which the immigrants come they are prohibited by statute and by usage from sending their children to school?

Mr. BROOKS. Well, of course that allowance would appeal to our sentiment, but it would not be worth anything practically.

Mr. BENNET. It would not be what?

Mr. BROOKS. I say it would appeal to our sentiment, but it would be of no service to us practically.

Mr. BENNET. Don't you think there is any difference between a man who has had an opportunity to learn to read and who does not do so and a man who would like to learn to read if he could, but who is prohibited by law from doing so?

Mr. BROOKS. Of course there would be a difference of allowance, as a mere matter of favor.

I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. We will hear from Mr. Roe.

STATEMENT OF A. A. ROE, REPRESENTING THE BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN AND THE BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE FIREMEN AND ENGINEMEN.

Mr. ROE. I do not know that I can say what I would like to say within this short time. I also have an appointment for 12 o'clock, and I would appreciate it if an arrangement could be made so that I could appear before this committee before this matter is closed up. I would like to be heard on the subject before it is closed up.

The CHAIRMAN. Your request is granted. We will hear you tomorrow morning at 10.30 o'clock.

(Thereupon the committee adjourned.)

[Copy of brief left with Judge Taft, Augusta, Ga., January 20, 1909.]

In re protest against the reappointment of Secretary Straus as Secretary of Commerce and Labor of the United States, by Dr. Albert Warren Ferris, president of the New York State commission in lunacy, authorized by the three commissioners to make this protest.

JANUARY 20, 1909.

New York State cares for 30,000 insane persons in her 15 public state hospitals.

About 45 per cent of these insane persons are of foreign birth, whereas less than 35 per cent of the total population of the State is of foreign birth.

New York receives 35 per cent of the entire foreign immigration into the United States.

Of immigrants admitted to hospitals or certified as defective or diseased on arrival or held for special inquiry, over 70 per cent remain in New York.

New York State maintains a board of three alienists who detect as far as possible the incoming alien insane, with a view to securing their deportation under section 2 of the immigration act of 1907 and to deporting alien insane who appear in the different hospitals throughout the State, from time to time.

Following the example of New York State, the Marine-Hospital Service also established a board of three alienists, who work in harmony with the New York men.

The immigration laws of 1907 are ample and adequate if properly enforced according to their terms. Under certain rules, established by the Commissioner-General of Immigration under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, certain alien insane are landed whose landing is especially forbidden in plain terms by section 2 of the immigration laws. Now, these rules, according to section 22, shall not be "inconsistent with law." Yet rule 6, Appeals, page 31, paragraph 2, is inconsistent with the law in that it provides for the admission of an insane alien if not "likely to become a public charge." Section 2 of the laws, although containing other provisos, makes no provision for landing insane aliens who may not become public charges. The same paragraph of rule 6 arranges that the medical certificate of mental defect and the determination of the existence of insanity by qualified medical experts shall be considered by a lay "board of inquiry," who shall "reach their own conclusions," since it is stated that "the question to be determined is a practical one quite as much as a medical one." We hold that this rule is unlawful, that the question is purely a medical one, and that section 2 grants no opportunity for such interpretation or amendment.

Rule 20 (p. 39) provides for admission under bond of aliens suffering from "some physical defect" only. The Secretary stretches this rule, improperly, to cover cases of insanity, and admits them under bond, whereas section 2 of the laws gives him no such authority. The Secretary here falls back on section 26, which gives limited authority as follows: An alien "liable to be excluded because likely to become a public charge or because of physical disability other than tuberculosis or a loathsome or dangerous contagious disease may, if otherwise admissible, nevertheless be admitted in the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, upon the giving of a suitable and proper bond," etc. The Secretary lands insane aliens under such a bond illegally, we claim, because they are not "otherwise admissible." While not suffering with a contagious disease, they are positively forbidden to land under section 2. We hold he acts illegally when he lands them under bond.

According to section 20, when landed in violation of the law, an alien shall be taken into custody and deported after becoming a public charge from conditions existing before landing. Cases landed improperly by the Secretary are brought to his notice after they become public charges in our state hospitals for the insane, and even if it is proved that they were brought from foreign insane asylums to this country, he still refuses to deport them. Yet section 20 is mandatory.

If the Secretary held a brief for the defective, diseased, and insane aliens he could not have devised a more specious argument to nullify the immigration laws than appears in "decision No. 116," issued October 12, 1908, from the Department of Commerce and Labor, and termed an "interpretation of immigration act."

On page 2 of this decision he suggests that "the Secretary may hold in individual cases that the particular person concerned may not fall within the general scope of the act." By what authority can he hold that a particular insane alien does not fall within the scope of the phrase "all insane persons" of section 2 of the laws?

He states (p. 2) that "the immigration law deals with individuals in the mass" and that the act "is concerned with a stream of immigrants rather than with immigrants singly." Is not this a cunning evasion? Shall we judge our drinking water as a stream, disregarding the typhoid units we see are in it? Shall we admit several anarchist units because the stream averages well?

He adds that the act "provides for the exclusion of aliens by classes rather than by specific enumeration." What does this mean? Are the forbidden insane belonging to the industrious classes or the well-to-do classes to be admitted with the class, even though insane? He entirely misses the meaning of the term "class" in the law.

On page 3 of the decision he says that "alien" used without the word "immigrant" nevertheless means "alien immigrant," and then by specious reasoning decides that the temporary sojourner has not migrated, and hence is not an immigrant, and, further, that the law which expressly forbids the landing of an "alien" afflicted with disease or mental defect really means to admit such an "alien" if not an immigrant, for he insinuates that the framers of the law undoubtedly meant to insert the word "immigrant" where they expressly omitted it. Our answer to this shift is that section 2 of the laws does not say "immigrant," but "all insane persons" comprised under the

term "aliens." Is not the Secretary perilously near assisting forbidden aliens to land? The case the Secretary cites, bottom of page 3 and top of page 4 of the decision, argues strongly against this position.

On page 6 of the decision the Secretary tries to identify landing "with the intention of deporting therefrom after a temporary stay" with "passing through in transit," the latter being allowed by law, the former not being allowed by law.

The Secretary tries to distract our attention by altruistic sentiments regarding "our conceptions of liberty," "health and happiness and fortune;" but we can not swerve from our plain duty as laid down in section 2 where it says "all insane persons" shall be excluded.

We regard the Secretary as prejudiced, unreasonable, and dangerous.

New York State is no longer willing to receive the insane he is landing through executive clemency or on worthless bonds.

Appended hereto are some instances of what we consider improper landing, by the Secretary, of forbidden insane aliens.

In some instances of the landing of insane aliens our physicians are told at first that there is not sufficient evidence produced to warrant belief by the Secretary that the cause of insanity existed prior to landing. In many of these instances affidavits are immediately obtained which give ample and sufficient evidence, and then there follows a plan of allowing the retention of these aliens through their friends giving bond that they will not become public charges and paying "the reimbursing rate" to our hospitals. This "reimbursing rate" of \$3.50 per week is about one-half of the actual cost of maintaining a patient, and therefore the patient is certainly a public charge. Besides this, it is a fact that the New York State hospitals are intended for the people of our State and not for deportable aliens.

The following cases have all come up within the past year:

No. 1923, Fannie Cannon. Located at Manhattan State Hospital, January 23, 1908. Landed March 29, 1906. Had been insane five years prior to landing and gained a landing in violation of law. Was bonded by Mr. Lauterbach and the board of directors of the Hebrew Orphan Asylum. Five children became public charges, one or two having been born in this country, and they were cared for by the Hebrew Orphan Asylum.

No. 2092, Rosie Golupchuch. Located at Central Islip State Hospital, March 26, 1908. Landed May 22, 1907. As in all of these cases, no attempt was made to dispute the fact contained in our certificates. The alien was landed under bond, September 29, 1908.

No. 2118, Bertha Cerowsky. Located at Manhattan State Hospital, April 3, 1908. Landed November 12, 1907. Bonded September 29, 1908.

No. 2177, Cecelia Bonne. Fresh from Morningside Asylum, Scotland. Landed March 9, 1908. Admitted Poughkeepsie State Hospital, April 24, 1908. Then about two months out of the asylum in Scotland, but landed under bond.

No. 2178, Florence Bonne. Daughter of the above was from the same asylum. Landed same date. A chronic lunatic.

No. 2218, Minnie Drucker or Trener. Landed September 17, 1907. Admitted May 13, 1908, to Central Islip State Hospital. An imbecile with episodes. Landed under bond.

No. 2436, Joseph Zaharia. Landed June 16, 1907. Admitted to Manhattan State Hospital, August 1, 1908. Insane for ten years. Given a landing under bond.

It is to be understood that in all of these cases all of the alienists agreed that the cause of insanity existed prior to landing. The fact that this existed is not disputed by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, but he maintains that by bonding these people to pay the reimbursing rate in the public institutions that they are no longer public charges and hence not amenable to deportation. (NOTE.—Rule 20 does not permit landing insane aliens under bond.)

The following cases also were considered to be "prior to landing" cases by everybody except the Secretary, who gave them a landing without bonding them and without specific excuses.

No. 1691, Fannie Heyman. Landed October 5, 1906. Admitted to Manhattan State Hospital November 1, 1907. Insane twice prior to landing. Secretary refused to deport. This case was recently readmitted to Manhattan State Hospital, following the birth of a child who, of course, is an American citizen. Another attempt will be made to deport this case, as this is her fourth attack of insanity within the last four years.

No. 1855, Paula Cohen. Landed January, 1907. Located at Central Islip State Hospital, December 28, 1907. The alien was given a landing notwithstanding both certificates.

No. 1996, Sure Medmann. Landed October 9, 1906. Located at Manhattan State Hospital, February 21, 1908. Secretary refused to deport notwithstanding both certificates.

No. 2119, Bessie Wodofski. Located at Manhattan State Hospital April 6, 1908. A chronic case. Landed under bond.

Doctor Mabon wrote to-day that the people going on the bond in this case have expressed the desire of giving up the bond. This is the case in which some of the friends told Doctor Mabon that they would take this step as soon as three years had expired. Only two years have expired at this time, and the commissioner has been asked to take up the case again and dispose of it on its merits. Of course we are ignorant of the ultimate disposal of the case at this time.

[Extract from speech of Hon. E. A. Hayes in House, February 25, 1909.]

In 1906 President Roosevelt appointed a commission, composed of J. W. Jenks, R. M. Easley, and J. B. Reynolds, to consider the Chinese boycott and the smuggling of Chinese into the United States. That commission reported to Secretary Straus in 1908, and the concluding paragraphs of that report are as follows:

"Our commission, therefore, has reached the conclusion that the demoralization of the bureau in its Chinese service is widespread, and unless radically reformed serious complications, both political and commercial, are threatened. Our commission did not consider that its duty was to make definite, formal charges against particular officials, except as incidental results of investigation, but to present to you as full a statement as possible of the bureau's relation to the causes of the boycott, leaving it to you to determine what action should be taken.

"In no point does the demoralization of the bureau appear more striking than in its failure to prevent the smuggling of coolies. We found no evidence of systematic efficient effort to check such widespread violations of the law. The recommendations of Greenhalge to the commissioner-general that the Government should attempt to catch the leading white smugglers, upon whom the smuggling system depends, seemed to your commission the most practicable method of securing substantial results. This suggestion appears to have been unheeded. From my present knowledge of the situation I am confident that with intelligent and energetic handling the extensive smuggling which exists to-day might be practically wiped out.

"It is therefore the earnest hope of your commission that the relations between the Chinese in this country and the American Government, through the Bureau of Immigration, may be essentially improved; that more determined effort and persistent effort may be made for the suppression of blackmail and the smuggling of Chinese coolies, and that a higher standard in the selection of immigration officials may be enforced."

These conditions were brought to the attention of the proper department long ago. In August and September, 1907, Professor Jenks, of the Immigration Commission, with Mr. Atkinson, secretary of that commission, visited the Canadian and Mexican borders, investigating and reporting conditions to the Secretary of Commerce and Labor. On his return from that trip he gave to Secretary Straus evidence of complicity on the part of a number of inspectors in the wholesale smuggling of Chinese on both borders, and I ought to say that I do not get this information from Professor Jenks.

[Clipping from the New York Tribune, May 19, 1909.]

W. WILLIAMS NAMED—PRESIDENT APPOINTS HIM COMMISSIONER OF IMMIGRATION.

The President to-day sent the name of William Williams, of New York City, to the Senate as Commissioner of Immigration at Ellis Island, regarded as the most important post in the immigration system of the country. The following statement was given out at the White House:

"This post has been recently held by Robert Watchorn, whose administration of the office proved to be unsatisfactory to the President and the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, although there have been interested in his retention a number of good people who did not understand the facts in respect to the condition of the office. Mr. Watchorn's resignation was not requested, but he was under investigation by Mr. Nagle, the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, and his course in office was the subject of inquiry at the time he tendered and insisted upon his resignation. His resignation was accepted for the good of the service.

"Mr. Williams has had a very long and thorough experience in the administration of this office, and resigned it voluntarily to resume the practice of law in New York

City. The President and the Secretary were anxious to have the office administered with a single view to its efficiency in the enforcement of the immigration laws and to a proper protection of the immigrants coming into this country. Mr. Williams's record in his previous administration insures this result. Mr. Williams is a Yale man and a friend of the President's, and was not a candidate for appointment, but most reluctantly yielded to the insistence of the President and the Secretary that he take the office in order to put it again on a proper basis.

"It has been reported that Mr. Watchorn's resignation was due to political exigency. This statement is utterly unfounded, and the appointment of Mr. Williams is the most complete refutation of that statement that could be made. The Secretary of Commerce and Labor and Mr. Williams have had conferences about the administration of Ellis Island and are in complete accord as to how the island should be administered."

Mr. Williams, who was born in London forty-six years ago, was appointed to succeed Thomas Fitchie as Commissioner of Immigration of this port in April, 1902. He held the place until January, 1905, when he sent his resignation to President Roosevelt, who, after expressing his regret that Mr. Williams desired to resign, appointed Robert Watchorn as his successor. Mr. Williams was graduated from Yale University in 1884 and from the Harvard Law School in 1888. He spent much of his early life at school in Germany. After his admission to the bar he opened a law office in this city, and in 1892 was one of the junior counsel for the Government in the Bering Sea arbitration. At the time of the Spanish war he took the field with Squadron A in 1898, and was commissioned as major in the Quartermaster's Department. Mr. Williams is a Republican, but has not taken any active part in politics. For many years he has made the University Club his home.

[Matter showing attitude of the Northwestern States and that our public domain is gone and that our population is recoiling upon itself and crowding into our cities and across into Canada.]

Recently in an elaborate address before the St. Paul Commercial Club, James J. Hill said: "Our public domain is exhausted. Last year over a million people came from across the Atlantic to the United States, and the natural increase certainly is a million and a half more. What is to become of these people? They are to be driven into the factories and workshops. They can go or crowd us over into the Canadian Northwest, as many have been crowded. But that country will be populated to its comfortable extent very soon, much sooner than you think. It has not an unlimited area."

The 1909 annual report of the superintendent of immigration shows that during the twelve months ending March 31, 59,832 United States citizens settled in Canada, taking with them money and effects valued at \$60,000,000.

Like the Italians, Greeks, and Slovaks, many of the Austrians and Hungarians are here only for a few years to earn and save a little money and then return to their own country, while others come to take their place. (Wisconsin Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1905-6, p. 318.)

[Article from the Farmers' Union News, Union City, Ga., February 10, 1909.]

On October 13, Mr. Oscar Straus, the present Secretary of Commerce and Labor, a member of President Roosevelt's Cabinet, and under whom and in whose department is the Bureau of Immigration, gave to the Associated Press at Washington another one of his slick, ingenious news items.

The opposition of Straus to all immigration legislation is already notorious and proverbial, and yet he is in charge of the enforcement of our immigration laws; his pro-immigration attitude is nothing short of scandalous. Coming, as he does, from Wall street, and being identified, as he always has been, with its financial exploiters, his fragrant relaxation and breaking down of the administration of our immigration and other laws which further the selfish interests of cotton gamblers, stock waterers, and predatory cliques has not been in the least surprising.

Mr. Straus succeeded Mr. Metcalf as Secretary of Commerce and Labor on December 17, 1906, and immediately proceeded, in the face of a continued deterioration in the quality and character of immigration, to reduce the percentage debarred during the next six months from 1.3 per cent, which it was under Metcalf during the previous six months, to 0.8 of a per cent reduction, or rather breaking down in the administration of the law over 38 per cent.

Such statistics, indisputable as they are, contain a very meager indication of the violence that Oscar Solomon Straus has done to laws and regulations which have been

found absolutely necessary to protect the Northeast, and, in fact, the whole country, from the stream of the lower foreign classes that have been poured in upon us from the worst sections of Europe and Asia. One need only visit New York or Boston to get an idea of what is beginning to take place and the necessity for sifting out the very undesirable elements, social dregs, and really scum of foreign populations that are being dumped upon us by foreign countries and foreign steamship lines. A talk with any of the old immigration officials will readily convince the interviewer of the scandalous relaxation that has taken place since December 17, 1906. The inspectors, members of the boards of special inquiry, and other officials will tell you how they have had to respond to these subtle but unmistakable signs from the Secretary's office at Washington. They will tell you how the personnel of the force has changed, how men who did not respond have lost their positions or been transferred, and how foreigners of Mr. Straus's religious faith have been promoted and appointed to every official vacancy occurring in order to carry out his outrageous antirestriction views.

At Washington Mr. Straus has under him as chief of the new Division of Information Mr. Powderly, who several years ago was forced out of the commissioner-generalship.

Powderly was, until Mr. Straus got hold of him, a restrictionist. He has spoken and written so often in favor of restriction that some writers are still quoting him because of the weight and authority naturally attaching to the utterances of one occupying the high office of Commissioner-General of Immigration. He knows this, and, knowing it, must feel greatly embarrassed when, to keep a job, he manufactures new speeches and opinions at variance with those of only yesterday.

We have no particular objections to his holding down a government job. He is as much entitled to it as the man who made his appointment. What we do object to is his touring the country at our, the Government's, expense in favor of more immigrants; and to his manufacturing officially a lot of supercilious, cheap, humanitarian talk in favor of immigration, which the European immigration societies, the foreign steamship companies, and American employers of cheap labor, land speculators, and stock gamblers will use at home and abroad to increase the influx of foreign undesirables. It is his Tommy-rot gabble about the large amount of uncultivated cotton lands in the South and the great need of southern lands and planters for farm labor with which to increase the amount of cotton produced, to which we make serious objection. He is not telling the truth when he says that southern farmers need and want not only the prospective foreign influx of brownish races from southeastern Europe and western Asia, but will also be glad to have distributed among them the foreign classes from the city slums of the Northeast, which are the cause of so much poverty, disease, crime, and political corruption there.

This proposal of Mr. Straus and Mr. Powderly to distribute the incoming tide and the stranded thousands of poverty-stricken, diseased, and disruptive foreign elements now in the northeastern cities has, of course, met with the approval of the weary charity workers and others of the Northeast anxious to get rid of the serious immigration evils from this country being made a dumping ground for undesirable foreign immigration. It is by means of this false distribution wrinkle that Secretary Straus plans to prevent, not only the enactment of additional needed restrictive measures, but the decent enforcement of existing immigration laws which are such a very poor protection to the country's welfare, even when vigorously enforced. This distribution hoax is gotten up to silence the Northeast's demand for additional restrictive legislation. All that is necessary to make it good is a little evidence tending to show that there is room down South. Now, Mr. Straus proposes to supply this, for, according to his last news item, he is sending out 806,000 return postal cards. These cards will go to the various rural-delivery carriers in the States of Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, and other Southern States for distribution among the farmers with whom he desires to get in personal touch, and whom he says need and want aliens.

Let every union man be on the watch for these postal cards. They are coming 806,000 strong. Ask your rural-route carrier for several of them, and sit right down and tell Messrs. Straus and Powderly what you think of their subtle scheme to commit the South to foreign immigration. And if you don't get a return postal card, don't wait, write him at Washington, D. C., on one of your own. And don't forget to make your meaning clear. Tell him that you see through his crafty scheme to go to Congress and the United States Immigration Commission with these replies as proof that the South is in favor of this present foreign influx of brownish alien races, and that you want to register an emphatic protest against their admission and in favor of the vigorous enforcement of existing laws and the enactment of additional restrictive measures, such as the money test, and increased head tax, and the illiteracy test. And go him one better, and tell him that you don't want any more outside interference

or intermeddling with not only southern government but also southern industry and labor. And tell him further that you want to see the Bureau of Information and Display, at whose head is Mr. Powderly, and which is being worked over into a foreign employment agency and a bureau of distribution of aliens to the South, abolished—and ask him to kindly turn your card over to the Immigration Commission, with the request that your protest be noted in its report. Don't forget to tell Messrs. Powderly and Straus and also your Congressmen and Senators that what you want is not the distribution of these aliens, but their exclusion. Tell them that you have had experience with one alien race, and that you do not care to run the risk of history repeating itself by bringing in a kindred race of brownish people who are sure to cause all kinds of trouble, as they have in the few localities to which these brownish people have gone in the South. Tell them that you do not want any more of the Mafia, the Black Hand, the Camorra, the Hunchakist, and other murderous bands. Tell it to them now, and tell it to them in as strong, plain, and unmistakable language as you can find. Don't wait. Do it now, else it will be too late, and lest you forget. (The Journal, Washington, D. C.)

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 9, 1910.

The committee met at 10.30 o'clock a. m., Hon. Benjamin F. Howell in the chair.

Others present were: Representatives Hayes, Moore (Texas), Sabbath, O'Connell, Goldfogle, Burnett, Küstermann, and Elvins.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, we are to meet this morning to hear Mr. Roe, who represents various railroad organizations and employees. Mr. Roe, you may make your statement.

Mr. BURNETT. What branch of the railroad service, Mr. Roe, do you represent?

Mr. ROE. I represent the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. Mr. T. J. Brooks, who appeared yesterday for the Farmers' Union, would like to have just a moment to say something to the committee, and I give way to him.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a statement merely for the sake of justice to the record. It was called into question yesterday as to whether or not there was such a paper as The Journal published in this city, from which I quoted, and I now present a copy of The Journal [laying a copy on the table], from which Mr. Duckworth took the Farmers' Union News article.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. BROOKS. It is published here in the city of Washington, at 43 B street NW., and the editor tells me that he has a circulation of 180,000.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Is that circulation certified to the post-office people?

Mr. BROOKS. I could not say. The editor, Mr. Hayes, stated that to me. It is published right across the street here, in the same block as the Immigration Commission is situated.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Is that paper connected with the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. BROOKS. No, sir. The Knights of Labor.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Has it any affiliation with the American Federation of Labor, I mean?

Mr. BROOKS. The affiliation between the Knights of Labor and the American Federation of Labor I am not acquainted with.

Mr. HAYES. No; there is none.

Mr. BROOKS. There was also a question raised—in particular by Mr. Bennet, I believe—with regard to whether any member of this committee had said on the floor of the House on the 25th of February, 1901, the words which I read. Those words were taken from a speech reported on page 3216 of the Congressional Record, and delivered by Congressman E. A. Hayes, who, I believe, is a member of the committee and is present here to-day. The other extract was taken from a speech delivered in the House by Congressman John L. Burnett, who, I believe, is a member of the committee and a member of the Immigration Commission, and is also present.

Mr. BURNETT. What was that extract? I was not here yesterday.

Mr. BROOKS. It appears on page 3921 of the Record of the same Congress; that is, volume 43. Mr. Bennet must have been present when the speech was delivered in the House, as he asked a question, according to the Congressional Record, nine lines above the portion from which I quoted.

The CHAIRMAN. The statement you made yesterday was in regard to Mr. Burnett, and then you said another member of the commission, not of the committee. That is what was taken exception to.

Mr. HAYES. I am not a member of the commission.

Mr. BURNETT. What was the statement of Mr. Burnett that Mr. Bennet challenged?

Mr. BROOKS. Do you want it read?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. HAYES. He did not challenge it.

Mr. BURNETT. Oh, then, I do not care for it.

Mr. BROOKS. That is all I wish to submit. I thank you for your giving me permission to do so.

STATEMENT OF A. A. ROE, REPRESENTING THE BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN AND THE BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE FIREMEN AND ENGINEMEN.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee:

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Roe.

Mr. ROE. The question as to the advisability of further restricting foreign immigration, now under discussion, is one of increasing importance to the wage-earner of America. While the members of the railway brotherhoods are the least directly affected—I mean by that, that the position they fill in our industrial system is less likely to be filled by the foreign immigrant than the less skilled occupations—we, as a part of society, however, are vitally concerned in the question before us; and indirectly competed with by the consequent increase of workers “pushed up,” as they say, into the skilled groups by the strenuous competition and large numbers of unskilled below used to very low standards of living. Then, too, in recurrent times of depression the large number of unemployed unskilled makes it absolutely impossible for the skilled, who are first to be thrown out of employment and last to find employment with the return of prosperity a few years later, to find unskilled employment enough to tide them over until employment and business pick up. Such strong competition, even though indirect, does affect seriously wages and

conditions of employment in the skilled trades, such as locomotive firemen and enginemen.

I desire at this time to read from the proceedings of the Ninth Biennial Convention of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, held at Columbus, Ohio, in May, 1909. This convention was composed of 900 delegates, representing more than 100,000 railroad employees, actually engaged in the operation of railroad trains. The following resolution is similar to many others that have been passed by the railway brotherhoods in convention during the last eight or ten years:

Whereas immigration to the United States and Canada is in such number and of such class as to cause grave apprehension as to its effect upon the living conditions of our wage earners, and as we know that the result is already noticeable in a social, financial, and moral way in every occupation affected by the flood of newcomers, we believe it eminently fitting that this convention go on record as opposed to present laws that permit this addition to our already overwhelming classes of inhabitants of this kind. The country has been fairly able to assimilate the immigrants that have come to us until within the past few years, but the continual procession of newcomers with their ideas of living and observance of law that are entirely foreign to our own and which have a tendency to lower the present standard of wages, morals, and social conditions have been more than we could well assimilate. The idea of filling the country with so many people that there are two men ready for every position threatens our positions and homes, and fully realizing that it is highly necessary that something must be done to bar out the undesirable, criminal, illiterate, and paupers which furnish the sweat shops and the congested districts with their victims and menace all labor, thereby encouraging and maintaining the padrone system and recruiting the criminal forces of our country; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen use its best efforts to secure adequate laws to protect our homes and occupations from this invasion of undesirable immigration and ask for the enactment of a law that will effectually bar the pauper, the illiterate, the criminal, and the contract laborer from this country; and, be it further

Resolved, That our position on this question be made known to the President of the United States and the Premier of Canada.

Mr. BURNETT. What is the date of that?

Mr. ROE. May, 1909.

The demand for the restriction of foreign immigration can be justified on the broad ground of self-defense. The questions of home production and home consumption are inseparable, and without a corresponding degree of the latter with the former production naturally must suffer, unless there is something of extra demand for outside markets to offset the failure of domestic consumption. This does not necessarily mean that each workman must consume the products he makes, but it means that he must purchase according to his means (of other products), so that in turn all demands will be stimulated by his necessities supplied by home markets.

The new immigrant is a cheap liver; if he were not, he would not be an immigrant, for it takes dissatisfaction with home conditions to force a man to leave them. The living conditions of the bulk of our immigrants are far below our cheapest standard of living, and as long as the newcomer works with the idea of taking care of himself here and his relatives abroad and of saving sufficient money to enable him to return to his own country with enough to live comfortably, he can not raise his standard of living. In short, he does not spend the wages he makes, and therefore he is not a desirable workman from a comparative viewpoint of production and consumption.

During the present discussion of the high cost of living we have heard the arm-chair philosopher tell us that the American workman

lives too high; that he should economize, and so forth. This, in our opinion, is not good logic. The unprecedented progress we have made as a nation is largely owing to the fact that the American workman advances his standard of living in the exact proportion to the increased compensation he receives, and should the workmen of America attempt to follow the advice thus offered by these philosophers the result would be disastrous. To illustrate: Should the wage-earners of this country unite and resolve that on and after the first day of April, 1910, they will reduce their expenditures one-half, and carry the resolve into execution, the country would be thrown into an industrial depression in comparison with which all recent panics would sink into insignificance. Our present method of production and distribution makes it imperative that the wage-earner, who composes a large percentage of our entire population, consume all that his compensation will purchase, thereby increasing his efficiency, as well as living to do something else than merely work. Therefore, it can be readily understood that the immigrant, who is a cheap liver, is, in the present stage of our development, a menace to our society. Actual, bona fide investigation of the records of a large contracting company engaged in railroad construction and employing many laborers of various nationalities show that the actual cost to the company for groceries, provisions, and payment for cooks, waiters, fuel, lights, etc., at its boarding camps for a given period was 19 cents a meal, or \$3.99 a week for each man. The men were charged \$18 a month for board and lodging.

The Italians at the camps of that company lived mostly on macaroni, sausage, cheese, sardines, and bread. Macaroni and bread were the staples, the sausage, sardines, and cheese being used very sparingly. The average monthly expense of the Italian laborer was as follows:

25 one-and-a-half pound loaves of bread, at 8 cents	\$2. 00
30 pounds of macaroni, at 7 cents	2. 10
Sausage, sardines, and cheese	1. 50
Lard 30
Total for food	5. 90

Mr. BURNETT. For how long?

Mr. ROE. One month.

Most of the Italians, in addition to the above, spent an average of \$3 per month for beer, cheap cigars, or tobacco, which, with the expense of \$1 per month for shanty rent, brings the total cost of living per man to \$9.90 per month.

Mr. BURNETT. Do they not spend anything for laundry?

Mr. O'CONNELL. I know some Members of Congress that buy cheap cigars.

Mr. ROE. An examination of the records of three railroad systems in New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, for 1905 and 1906, gives accurate records of the earnings and the total cost of living of large numbers of Italian laborers employed on those railroads and living under the usual commissary system. The average earnings per man for a representative month in 1906, for 89 gangs, numbering 1,530 men, were \$37.07. The cost of all food was \$5.30 and of rent of shanty and sundries \$1.49, or a total of \$6.79, leaving a surplus of \$30.28.

The average food consumption for the month per man of one group of 34 men, for the above number, was as follows:

Bread.....	pounds..	34.1
Macaroni.....	do....	19.3
Rice.....	do....	.24
Meat (sausage, corned beef, and cod).....	do....	2.31
Sardines.....	do....	.4
Beans, peas, and lentils.....	do....	2.06
Cheese.....	do....	1.00
Fatback (lard substitute).....	do....	5.13
Tomatoes.....	cans..	2.15
Sugar.....	pounds..	2.8
Coffee.....	do....	.43

Mr. BURNETT. I will ask you there, where did you get those figures; from what report—commissary reports or books of the commissaries where they work?

Mr. ROE. Yes. For these figures I am indebted to our official publication.

Mr. BURNETT. What I want to know is the source of the information.

Mr. ROE. I think they originally came from the Bureau of Labor, and by actual investigation of these camps and companies engaged in railroad construction.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Who made the investigation, or under whose direction?

Mr. ROE. I am under the impression that they were made originally under the direction of the Department of Commerce and Labor (Bulletin No. 72), and that is where we secured them. I am not positive of that, however, but I am quite sure you will find them in some official reports issued about that time by the Department of Commerce and Labor.

Mr. O'CONNELL. If I may be permitted to ask a question, without interrupting you, I would like to know if your statistician has gathered any facts as to whether or not the health of these workmen was affected by their frugal manner of living. I rather think that frugality ought to be commended. I do not believe in frugality that is going to injure the health of the people. What I would like to know, and what I think is most important for us to know, is whether or not this frugal manner of living in any way injures their health or makes them inferior as citizens and as men. Have you got facts on that?

Mr. ROE. I have not any facts.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. They look pretty healthy.

Mr. O'CONNELL. That is what I was coming to.

Mr. ROE. I rather think, however, that such figures are in existence, and can, perhaps, be obtained. I understand the Immigration Commission found on the steamship *Canopic*, when it went abroad, large numbers of prematurely decrepit and broken-down aliens going back home.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Until you get those kind of figures, it strikes me that these figures, generally speaking, are an argument the other way, because they are an indorsement of the frugality of these people.

The CHAIRMAN. What Mr. Roe is trying to show is that the labor coming into this country now is detrimental to the labor of this country.

Mr. ROE. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that any man who will subsist on the provisions as quoted here, with our present standard of society, can not be an advantage to that society.

Mr. BURNETT. And no decent American laborer could live on it, could he?

Mr. ROE. He would not.

Mr. BURNETT. Well, he could not and maintain his family in decency.

Mr. ROE. I feel this way, as I said a moment ago, that when any laborer coming to this country can save from an approximate amount of \$38 the sum of \$30.28 it has, among other things, a bearing, for instance, upon the home production and consumption which is detrimental to our present system.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Don't you think they will learn to spend money after a while? You know we are now trying to get the postal savings banks in order to teach people how to save. Now, you want them to spend all they earn. I suppose a good many of our workmen are doing that, and I believe that is to their own detriment.

Mr. ROE. I agree with you that many of our own workmen spend all the wages they get, but I have just endeavored to show to you that it is necessary that they spend it.

Mr. O'CONNELL. I would like to know why, if these men can get along in this way, it is necessary for our workmen to spend everything they earn. That is what I would like to have brought out.

Mr. ROE. It would not be necessary, if you would like to see the American workman live under those conditions.

Mr. O'CONNELL. I do not want the American workman to live in any other way than the manner that suits himself.

Mr. BURNETT. The American workman spends a little for washing and ironing once in a while, does he not?

Mr. ROE. The question is whether it is better or not for our society, for civilization, for the Government under which we live, to raise up a class of people who live in this manner.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Have you made an investigation as to what these men do with the surplus, the savings? Do they not, after having laid by what they consider to be a fair amount, go into business, especially small stores in the distant towns in the country, and do they not go into cities and establish a business with the savings of some years?

Mr. ROE. I believe that there are figures on that point which show that enormous sums are sent and carried back. I have read them, and I did not go to the trouble to submit them here, because I believed that with all the discussion that has taken place on this subject those figures were perhaps before the committee.

Mr. BURNETT. If you will permit me to answer that question, I will tell you that the report of the commission shows that \$200,000,000 go back every year to Europe; \$75,000,000 by the Italians alone.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. We expect to keep that money here after we get our postal savings banks, when they have confidence in the institution they deposit with.

Mr. BURNETT. They deposit it now, but draw it out and send it over there.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. No; they do not deposit it. They carry it around.

Mr. BURNETT. Our investigation shows that in New York there are a lot of Italian savings banks, among which were some fake concerns, with whom they deposited their money, and they went and drew it out whenever they wanted to send it over. They sometimes deposit their money in the post-office.

Mr. SABATH. That is the reason they send it home, because there are fake banks, and they have no confidence in them. In my own city alone, only a few weeks ago, as you may have read in the papers, there was one banker who got away with about \$240,000 of these people's money.

Mr. HAYES. There are families in Italy who are supported entirely by the money sent over from this country.

Mr. SABATH. Let the gentleman go on.

Mr. BURNETT. Let him answer my question.

Mr. ROE. Right along that line, Mr. Chairman, from my own personal knowledge, after having spent the greater part of my life, since I was 17 years old, on the railroads of this country, and after having come in contact to a more or less extent with that class of laborers who are usually employed in the construction of railroads—in some parts of the country they are Greeks, and in other parts Italians, and in still other parts Mexicans—I know that a great number of them invest their money in post-office money orders. I have seen them carrying around large wads of these post-office money orders.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Another argument for the savings bank.

Mr. ROE. And I have been called on one or two occasions by the Mexicans—having some knowledge of their language—to assist them in making out post-office money orders to be sent to Mexico. So that I know from my own personal experience that a great deal of this is true, without appealing to any records or statistics.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I would like to state that I know of a number of Germans who have lived here for a great many years, and still they send their money to the savings banks in the old country, because they have confidence in them and because they have lost their confidence in the banks here. We have had a failure in our place some thirty or forty years ago, and that shows that the banks have not regained the confidence of these people.

Mr. O'CONNELL. How can you blame a crowd of men of limited knowledge as to commercial matters, who live in a community such as Bridgeport is, where within the last two years they saw a bank president take four or five hundred thousand dollars away; or who, living in another community like Southbridge, Mass., see a trusted bank president get away with a couple of hundred thousand, or people living in a cultured city like Cambridge, Mass., seeing a bank clerk get away with \$150,000 in a period of six months—how can you blame men of limited commercial knowledge from having doubt as to the security of our financial institutions?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Let me call attention to the fact, also, of the defalcations in our own subtreasury, where men walk away with something like \$173,000 in one day, \$68,000 on another day, \$75,000 on another day; and we have those instances recorded in the records of this House.

Mr. O'CONNELL. I could multiply the instances that I have just mentioned probably one hundred fold, within the last twenty years.

Mr. HAYES. Who is blaming them, Mr. O'Connell? I blame ourselves for letting them come here and take their money back to Europe.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. O'Connell and Judge Goldfogle did not charge the Italians with getting away with this money.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Not for a minute.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I might add that I am not trying to fix the blame upon anyone. I take the position here that it is a matter of self-defense; it is the first law of nature—self-preservation—that prompts us to come here and ask for a remedy.

Mr. SABATH. Of course they do not compete with the American trainmen, do they?

Mr. ROE. Not directly. I do not know of one man that we term a foreigner, or an unnaturalized immigrant, employed in the capacity of trainman. But they do indirectly.

Mr. SABATH. They must be able to speak the English language before they can be employed on a railroad?

Mr. ROE. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Have you any knowledge of the trains of the Northeast?

Mr. ROE. Yes, sir.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Do you mean to say that there are no naturalized citizens of this country working among the trainmen?

Mr. HAYES. He said there were no unnaturalized.

Mr. O'CONNELL. I misunderstood you, then. What is the proportion of naturalized citizens among the members of the United Order of Trainmen?

Mr. ROE. I just made the statement that I do not know of any foreign unnaturalized citizen or aliens who can not speak English working as trainmen.

Mr. O'CONNELL. I was asking how many are naturalized.

Mr. SABATH. That would be hard to tell.

Mr. ROE. The gentleman, as I understand, asks what per cent of the members of this organization are naturalized citizens.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes.

Mr. ROE. And I answer that I do not know that there is a solitary member that is not a native or naturalized citizen of the United States.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. In fact, you do not accept any aliens in your organization?

Mr. O'CONNELL. You do not understand me. What I want to get at is this: How many members of your organization, who, having been born in foreign countries, have become naturalized citizens?

Mr. ROE. I have no figures on that question.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Can you give me any notion; have you any idea?

Mr. ROE. I could not; but if it is a matter of importance for the committee, I could get it by corresponding with our grand lodge, as all our members are compelled to pass examinations and take out insurance; and, consequently, those papers give the place and the date of the birth of each man, and so forth. So that it could be obtained very readily if the committee desires it.

Mr. O'CONNELL. My object in asking that was to know whether or not the coming in of men from foreign countries, who subsequently

become naturalized and who have joined your organization, has in any way tended to keep down the effort of the organization to get higher wages and shorter hours, or whether it has elevated your organization and helped along those very purposes.

Mr. ROE. I would say that they have not directly affected our organization.

Mr. O'CONNELL. How can you say that when you do not know? You just answered a minute ago that you did not know what those figures were.

Mr. ROE. You mean figures relating to those men coming into this country and becoming naturalized?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes; whether that type of men has elevated or injured you in your purpose.

Mr. ROE. I had reference to immigrants who came in and were not naturalized.

Mr. O'CONNELL. I am not talking about that; I am asking you about the qualifications that you lay down there, that a man must be a naturalized citizen before he becomes a member of your organization.

Mr. ROE. Well, that is, of course, a difficult problem; and as I said before, I could not answer off-hand.

Mr. O'CONNELL. It seems to be rather an important one, because if these men help you, you can encourage them, and if they hurt you you ought to be in a position to tell us just how they hurt.

Mr. ROE. I can answer that question, I believe, to your satisfaction by saying this: That I take the position that immigration is filling the country so full of men that we are not able to assimilate them, not able to furnish them employment, and while it does not affect us directly as an organization, we would be affected by a continuance of that system by the lowering of the standard of living. It does affect us indirectly. It would be a step backward, rather than forward, as I regard it.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I had a letter from New York, from the immigration commissioner, saying that they could take care of 2,000,000 immigrants in that State alone, to be used on the farms there.

Mr. BURNETT. Why do they not get them there?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. They are taking them just as fast as they can induce them to come.

Mr. HAYES. Why don't they come there?

Mr. SABATH. I really believe we ought to give Mr. Roe a chance. Time is passing; it is 25 minutes to 12.

Mr. ROE. As I have said the matter of restricting foreign immigration is a matter of self-defense. One of the most, if not the most, important problem confronting America to-day is the unemployed problem, ebbing and flowing more or less with the industrial conditions, and certainly intensified by free immigration of a lower standard of living.

Mr. O'CONNELL. I think this observation ought to be made at this point: The State of Massachusetts established an employment bureau for the unemployed a few years ago, at the time of the panic and depression, and a number of applications came in. Of course, everyone knows that depression and panic was an artificial one, brought about by means that should never have been employed. Within the last twelve months, the people connected with that enter-

prise have notified me that they would like me to send them as many men as I possibly could, if I came across them, because there were places where they could be put to work, and they could not fill the positions. That is the experience of Massachusetts, one of the most densely populated States in the Union.

Mr. ROE. Right there I might observe that within the last six months our organization has found it necessary to establish an employment agency or a distributing point in Chicago, because we had such an enormous number of men out of employment and seeking work. As I understand, the Massachusetts Employment Agency was established and extended in 1906-1908 as a result of the large number of unemployed.

Mr. SABATH. Men of what class?

Mr. ROE. Railroad trainmen and conductors. And I rather regard that class as a very good illustration of the conditions—a barometer, if you please.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Right there. You say you have so many unemployed. When I left my place in Wisconsin I happened to meet the superintendent of the Chicago and Northwestern Railroad, and I said, "How is it; have you any trouble to find men?" "Why," he says, "I have just now received an order for 20 or 24 brakemen who are wanted at another point on the Chicago and Northwestern, and I am unable to fill it."

Mr. ROE. Well, I can probably explain that.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Do not let me interrupt you any further.

Mr. ROE. You will find that there was trouble up there with the Northwestern about that time with its switchmen, and they were looking for strike breakers then.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Oh, no.

Mr. ROE. And you will probably find that in a great many cases where there is a great deal of agitation and advertisement for men there is some controversy between the organized workmen and the employers.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Let me ask this question. I do not like to interrupt you——

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to have Mr. Roe finish his statement.

Mr. O'CONNELL. I think this question ought to be asked here.

Mr. HAYES. Ask it when he gets through.

Mr. ROE. In times gone by we, as Americans, have fondly believed that this was an European problem, and it was only recently that it has begun to dawn upon the American public that we, too, have this problem to solve. This is manifested in the bread lines, the abject poverty and squalor that is so apparent in all of our great industrial centers.

There is a demand for cheaper labor that will work at a less wage in every country—in the very countries from which the very cheapest labor comes to this country.

We believe that we ought to get at the bottom, if we can locate it, by reducing the number of competitors for jobs; that is, by restricting immigration. We can not inject any sentiment into this argument. To my mind it is not a question to be based wholly on the fact as to whether or not the Italian, the Slav, the Hungarian, or the Greek possesses certain qualifications, but of the first law of nature—self-preservation. You have heard the representative of the Farmers'

Union, representing 3,000,000 farmers, emphatically state that there is no scarcity of labor in that industry. You have heard the representatives of the various trades unions state that large numbers of their members are constantly out of employment. We desire to remedy this condition by the restriction of foreign immigration.

We ought to get under this wage and unemployed problems just as we ought to get in under the financial system that now permits a few crazed speculators to plunge this country into financial depression over night, in spite of the fact that the mines, fields, and factories, natural and artificial resources, and human intelligence remain intact and are more promising than ever. With the proper restriction of foreign immigration, if the natural business of this country were permitted to go on unhampered by those who shrink behind special-privilege laws, there would be no story of unemployed; there would be no bread line in which honest men hide their faces and seek the shadow when they grab the chunk of bread and tin cup of coffee for fear some one they know may see them.

There would be no half-starved children, as pictured in the dailies of Chicago and New York, with their emaciated bodies and diseased systems crowding our public schools; society demands protection, and it must be remembered that it can only get as much of it as it gives.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the discussion that has taken place while I was making my statement has brought out one of the important points that I wanted to impress upon you, and that is the fact that we desire to restrict foreign immigration, because we believe that it is necessary in order to preserve our present standard of living. We believe that any system which builds up around a manufacturing industry a protection from foreign competition and leaves the American workingman free and compels him to compete with cheap European labor, is unfair and unjust. It is a travesty upon justice to impose heavy protective duties upon the products of foreign labor and allow the foreign pauper labor itself to come in free.

There is another point here that it might be well to dwell on a little further, and that is the question which was brought up here by Mr. O'Connell. I have here a clipping from the New York Times of Sunday, February 27, 1909, which states that J. C. Earl, financial secretary of the Bowery Mission, who is also in charge of the work of the Free Labor Bureau, conducted by the mission, said that he wrote to the governors as follows:

During 1908 I wrote the governor of every State in the Union, offering to supply help if he would send the addresses of farmers who wanted hands. From these letters I did not get a single reply showing that there was any great demand for farm hands.

Mr. SABATH. Well, the governors are not supposed to be employed in the line of procuring help. That is not their duty, to procure help for farmers.

Mr. ROE. I will include that entire clipping in the record.

Mr. BURNETT. I think the governors would have a greater interest in that than a Member of Congress would.

Mr. SABATH. No; a Member of Congress is always close to his people.

Mr. ROE. A good many people are apt to consider themselves better than some other nationality. It is a matter of opinion, and, for my part, I am not discussing this subject with any such narrow

view of the situation. I am not prepared to say that the Italian or the Slav or the Hungarian or the Mexican has not the natural attributes that go to make up good citizenship, in spite of all you read about the Mafia, Black Hand, etc. I would not say that. But, as stated repeatedly, it is not a question of whether or not they possess those qualities. Of course the offensiveness could be gotten around by saying they are different from us. But I will not say even that. It is a question of whether or not, I will say, we can use them; whether or not by bringing a foreigner into this country he is not replacing or ruinously competing with some one who is already here, who has fixed his residence here, and who has possibly become a citizen of this country. I think justice as well as charity begins at home, and I think those facts will bear me out in the statement that, under present conditions, we are not able to assimilate the great hordes that are annually coming to our shores and settling principally in the large industrial and labor centers of the Northeast.

I believe that the members of this committee in the consideration of this subject have a very grave responsibility. I take it that the subject of restricting foreign immigration will have an effect upon our present industrial conditions to a greater extent perhaps than you would think at first glance. For instance, take the trouble in Pennsylvania. Take these disturbances that are constantly arising in strikes, and they are deplorable, but how can we avoid them? The question has often been asked: "What is a starving man to do if he is out of employment and can not secure employment?" And it is a hard question to answer. So, I ask, What is the labor element to do? We can see destruction plainly ahead of us unless certain conditions can be changed. I ask, What are they to do? Are they to stand by and allow conditions to grow from bad to worse, or must they at some time take a stand which, naturally, results in these disturbances that we all regret so much?

Mr. SABATH. Will you permit me to ask you a question now?

Mr. O'CONNELL. I would rather that the gentleman would finish.

Mr. SABATH. Oh, I thought he was through now. I thought you had closed.

Mr. ROE. That has a bearing upon this subject.

The American workman—and when I say the American workman, I mean every wage-earner in America to-day—whether he is a native, has been naturalized or not. He is here, and he has to contend with this foreign labor, often brought for a purpose, or deluded and inveigled into coming. We can not take these American laborers that are here and push them all back in the standard of living as brought out here this morning, to the level of the Greek or the Italian. We can not do that, and when we attempt to do that, we bring on civil war—nothing short of it.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. You do not take these figures seriously, do you, as to the cost of living of these Italians?

Mr. ROE. Oh, indeed. They are indisputable facts, from official sources. I have observed them, and I know they are quite true.

Mr. HAYES. I can give you figures showing a lower cost of living than that.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes; and I can give them to you a great deal higher.

Mr. ROE. In answer to Mr. Goldfogle's question, I will say that I have seen them time and again along railroads where they were working, eking out just such an existence—baking their bread in the holes in the ground. They roll up the dough and add a little flour and water to it, and then put the whole in the side of the cut. Then they put a lot of wood in there and make a fire and bake their bread. They live on a very little, saving every possible cent to send or take back as a rule.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. That is a fine bread, too.

Mr. ROE. I am not questioning that, but I am talking about the cheapness of it, their ruinously low standard of living.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Why should he not do that?

Mr. ROE. There is no objection in the world to that. I was not objecting to his eating the bread, but the cheapness of it—his low standard of living.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Why do you urge that as an argument?

Mr. ROE. Because I do not want to see the people of this country, the wage-earners of this country, compelled to live in that manner—subjected to that ruinous cutthroat competition of cheap labor and low standards.

Mr. O'CONNELL. He is not compelled, is he?

Mr. ROE. He will be if these conditions continue—

Mr. SABATH. The American laboring man who works on the railroad alongside of these men lives in about the same way as these men do, does he not?

Mr. ROE. Well, I don't recall any such case to mind in recent years. He is being driven out because he can not compete—because he will not come down to those terms.

Mr. SABATH. But the fact that these foreign laborers come here and do the hard work is instrumental in procuring a higher position for the American laboring man; is not that true?

Mr. ROE. I would not say that. They are instrumental in forcing the American laboring man out of the employment that he once had, and subject him to an unfair competition when the Government protects the manufacturer in his products and gives him free trade in his labor.

Mr. SABATH. They are instrumental in forcing him out of a dollar-thirty-five position into a two-dollar-and-a-half and three-dollar position?

Mr. ROE. I would not say that was the whole story. I would say they are also instrumental in forcing him out of that occupation, and then it is up to the American to secure his employment somewhere else or do without. He has to come down to that level, seek another level, or walk the streets as many do.

Mr. BURNETT. And a great many of them do without because of that very fact.

Mr. ROE. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Oh, I do not believe that is so.

Mr. HAYES. I know it.

Mr. O'CONNELL. I do not know whether you do or not, Brother Hayes.

Mr. HAYES. I do know it, Mr. O'Connell.

Mr. SABATH. There is a certain percentage of men in this country, as well as abroad, that will not work.

Mr. HAYES. You say so.

Mr. SABATH. Well, we know that.

Mr. HAYES. I do not.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Political economy admits that condition all over the world.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. There are drones in every hive.

Mr. ROE. That, I think, is conceded; but we are discussing this subject on the broad proposition of the whole people. Unrestricted foreign immigration greatly increases the number. I am frank to say that I believe that every foreign workman who comes into this country takes the place of some American workingman, who wants higher wages and a higher standard of living than the foreigner, and the foreigner only takes the position because he is enabled to live cheaper. He has got to outbid, or rather underbid, him as a rule to get the job. Consequently, a lower standard of living forces some one either to recruit the ranks of the tramps, the Coxey's armies, or the ranks of the criminal and insane, if he is not so fortunate as to get some position whereby he can live.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. You say that these immigrants coming in here are a detriment to the people working here—the railroad man, we will say, for instance. Now, then, these roads—for instance, the Chicago and Northwestern, the St. Paul, and other roads up our way—are always extending their lines. How could they accomplish that work without employing these men, and if they do extend their lines are not your railroad men directly benefited by the extension of these lines, because that permits them to run more trains, which creates more work? It is just because those immigrants, those Italians, do that work of extending those lines through the different sections of the country that your men have more opportunity to work than they would have otherwise. I would like to know whether that is not a fact. I want to have things clear.

Mr. ROE. I would say yes in answer to that question, and speak from observation and experience.

Figures have been submitted from time to time from various sources showing the minimum amount upon which a workingman can live and support his family. I believe those figures run from \$600 to \$800 per year.

I say to you frankly that whenever employers of manual labor desire to pay, and will pay, that amount they will have no difficulty in getting laboring men of all nationalities to perform that service who are now living in this country; and I believe that if an advertisement is inserted in the papers in any city that will say, "We will give a competent laborer \$2 per day"—which would make approximately between five hundred and six hundred dollars per year—that for every 1,000 inhabitants he will get an answer. Americans performed all such labor before this present stream of cheap labor was started.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. You will have to draw them away from another occupation, Mr. Roe.

Mr. BURNETT. Yes; draw them away from the ranks of the unemployed.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Oh, there is not any such.

Mr. BURNETT. Two millions.

Mr. ROE. I have lived for some years in the great wheat belt of Kansas, and at certain times of the year we can read in the papers advertising the fact, or the supposed fact, that the farmers in that

part of the country are needing help very badly. Consequently, our freight trains are flooded with men coming down there looking for employment. At the same time we find certain advertisements in the papers calling for men in the iron-ore industries, and I suppose the conditions are the same there. From my own personal knowledge and observation in the western country, where they are certainly as prosperous as in any other part of the United States, we have the unemployed problem constantly to contend with.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. In what State is that?

Mr. ROE. The Western States, west of the Mississippi River.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I wish you would let me know just where they are so that I can get some of those people.

Mr. BURNETT. You will find them in Milwaukee.

Mr. SABATH. You were not applying that to your organization or the labor people whom you represent?

Mr. ROE. They are only detrimental to our organization in their consequences. Indirectly they compete. It is the condition their coming creates that affects us all.

Mr. SABATH. Is not your union stronger to-day and has it not a larger membership than it ever had before?

Mr. ROE. Yes, sir. It has to be; it has to have.

Mr. SABATH. Do they not receive now—and, mind you, I do not say they are receiving enough—but do they not receive to-day, notwithstanding that we have had a large immigration for the last ten years, just as high wages as they ever received before? Mind you, they are not even receiving enough now, because the price of living is so high. I believe they should receive at least 20 per cent more, but notwithstanding the fact of this large immigration they do receive to-day just as high wages as they ever did.

Mr. ROE. That is a fact; yes, sir. The money wage is greater.

Mr. SABATH. In what way, then, have you been damaged or hurt?

Mr. ROE. Just to the extent that we are members of society; just to that extent exactly we are affected by the unemployed problem; just to the extent that prices of food, clothing, and the number of good things of life have increased, and that is much more. Not because there are a great number in our organization that are unemployed, I will say, for the sake of argument, but because we would be unable to maintain our organization for sixty days were we the only organization.

Mr. SABATH. I think your organization is doing a great deal of good for the laboring men of our country, and I would like to see all laboring men organized and have such good leaders.

Mr. ROE. Consequently, when the foreigner comes to this country, he tends to supplant a man who is a member of an organization, and all organizations are weakened to that extent. That is an idea to be considered also.

Mr. SABATH. Don't you know that we are employing more men from day to day, and we are increasing our business and constructing more railroads, and need more men to operate the railroads?

Mr. ROE. The last report of the Interstate Commerce Commission does not say so. It shows a reduction of 217,000.

Mr. SABATH. That was during the Republican panic that we had.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Have not the labor organizations grown stronger each year during the last fifteen years?

Mr. ROE. Decidedly. They have had to.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Does not that dispose of your other argument that the influx of immigration has weakened your organizations, or that it tends to weaken them? How are you going to reconcile those two facts, that the influx of immigration tends to weaken your organization when, as a matter of fact, the organization has grown stronger along with the increase of immigration?

Mr. ROE. I would like to answer that question, and I will answer it this way: That these organizations sprung into existence not by a condition of prosperity; it was an adverse condition that brought them into existence.

Mr. O'CONNELL. That was long before this great flood of immigration started?

Mr. ROE. The flood of immigration displacing other men and tending to reduce the wages of the workingmen makes them go into organizations to protect themselves.

Mr. BURNETT. It made it more necessary.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes; and they have grown stronger, and they have gotten better conditions as a result of it. Is it not true that the condition of the workingman to-day, of both organized labor and unorganized labor, is better than it was ten years ago, particularly the conditions as to organized labor?

Mr. ROE. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNELL. And if that is so, how can you attribute the condition of the organized workingman to-day to the flood of immigration?

Mr. ROE. Just as I have explained. They have come in freely—been brought in to prevent us getting better conditions and even to lower wages and increase hours.

Mr. O'CONNELL. But your condition is better, is it not?

Mr. ROE. I will show you why it is better.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Well, it is better, as a matter of fact?

Mr. BURNETT. Is it better in proportion to the increased rate of living? The rate of living has increased 60 per cent and wages have increased only 20 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the gentleman finish; it is nearly 12 o'clock.

Mr. O'CONNELL. He has finished.

Mr. ROE. Now, I want to be plain on that question.

Mr. O'CONNELL. I want to have the whole truth.

Mr. ROE. I take this position, without any hesitancy at all, that as I see it, the influx displaces the workman of this country, the wage-earner, and causes a competition for his position, increases the number of applicants for work. This brought into existence the organizations, drove men together. They had to get into the organizations to give them power to maintain their position, to save the comforts of their homes, and if you say that is a good thing, well and good.

Mr. SABATH. It is a good condition; organization is a good condition, and if they are responsible for any improvements in the condition of the workingmen, then they are entitled to thanks.

Mr. ROE. A better condition would be one that would not require the organization; would not make the organization necessary. A better condition would be one where hours, conditions of employment, and wages were such that organization of labor for these purposes was unnecessary.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Would you not rather have an organized body of men, enabled through power of organization, through force of numbers, through the influence that organization always brings, to secure better conditions and the correction of evils?

Mr. ROE. Oh, yes; that is better. It is good for educational and social purposes, of course. But I say there is a condition due to unrestricted foreign immigration largely whereby the organization would not be necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, 12 o'clock having arrived, we will stand adjourned until to-morrow until half-past 10. Mr. Bennet wants to be heard to-morrow.

(Thereupon, at 12 o'clock m., the committee adjourned until Thursday, March 10, 1910, at 10.30 o'clock a. m.)

I have here a newspaper clipping from the New York Times of February 27, 1909, which would seem to be of interest and throw later light than the symposium of letters submitted by the Board of Trade of New York City upon the entire subject covered by those letters and particularly upon the answers claimed to have been received, from the governor of Nebraska, and numbered 50. I should like very much if the committee would have this clipping incorporated as a part of my statement:

[The New York Times, Saturday, February 27, 1909.]

SAYS WESTERN JOBS ON FARMS ARE MYTHS.

BOWERY MISSION MAKES A TEST OF A DEMAND FROM NEBRASKA FOR 1,000 MEN—TOLD ALL PLACES ARE FILLED—THE BREAD LINE DIMINISHING, BUT SECRETARY EARL ESTIMATES THERE ARE STILL 150,000 IDLE MEN IN THE CITY.

"In an effort just made to place a number of the unemployed men in the Bowery Mission bread lines on farms in Nebraska and the West I find that there is a vast difference of opinion between the newspapers, state officials, and farmers of the West as to the need of more help from the East," said John C. Earl, financial secretary of the Bowery Mission, who is also in charge of the work of the free labor bureau conducted by the mission, to a Times reporter yesterday.

"On February 10 there appeared in two papers published in Omaha, Nebr., stories with flaring headlines telling of the crying need of farmers for help," continued Mr. Earl. "These stories were based on an interview with Deputy Commissioner of Agriculture W. M. Maupin, of Nebraska, in which he said he knew of cases enough to give employment to 1,000 men from the East if they could be obtained. In the course of his interview Mr. Maupin gave the names of 25 farmers, who, he said, he knew to need from 5 to 20 men each.

"A few days after this story appeared in the papers I received a communication from A. W. Frick, of Fentonville, Nebr., in which he inclosed the clippings from both of the papers, and said that if the people of New York who were running the Bowery Mission bread line wanted to they could place a number of men on these Nebraska farms, where help was so badly needed. Mr. Frick intimated, as has been done by lecturers and certain newspaper writers, that the Bowery Mission bread line was composed of a lot of drunken loafers who did not want to work, but were satisfied to remain in New York for the bread and coffee daily.

"I immediately wrote Mr. Frick and asked him to send me the addresses of any farmers who wanted help. I wrote the two newspapers, asking for the same information, and sent a similar letter to Deputy Commissioner Maupin. Then I wrote to each of the farmers whose names and addresses Mr. Maupin had given. In reply the newspapers say they have no addresses, Mr. Frick says that since writing all of the farmers have been supplied with the help they need, and Mr. Maupin replies that there was all the help needed in the State just now. This he says, despite the fact

that he asserted two weeks ago that the farmers were in need of help and that 1,000 men could be placed. The farmers said they were supplied.

"This is a trouble we are constantly having. Newspapers print stories that help is badly needed in certain sections of the country. We offer to furnish honest, industrious, sober men who are willing to take any kind of work, since they have been out of employment for months, and then we find that the work is not there.

"During the past twelve months the free labor bureau of the Bowery Mission has sent out 3,500 men to farmers, and from reports we have received less than one-half of 1 per cent of the men failed to arrive at their destination and the greater part of them have given satisfaction. Of course there have been some complaints of the men sent, but these complaints are based entirely on the inability of the men to do certain technical parts of the farm work, such as milking a cow or operating a mowing machine immediately upon their arrival.

"In addition to this a very large proportion of these men have of their own accord written us of their safe arrival and of their satisfaction at the place we found for them. This we regard as very gratifying, for the temptation to the men if they were not honest in their purpose would prove very great. We require the farmers to send the price of transportation. Then we give the men a ticket to their destination and money with which to buy their meals en route."

Mr. Earl said that there were now in this city 150,000 men out of work and that a large number of these are being assisted by their families or friends. He said that the Bowery Mission bread line had fallen off considerably and that it now averages about 2,000 men per night.

"Most of these men are willing to go to work if we can find places for them, and they are being sent out of the city to farms in the nearby States as fast as applications are made for them," said Mr. Earl. "Of course, we have applications for help that we can not fill," he continued. "Some farmers write us for practical farm hands who must be able to do any kind of farm work. Now, on the bread line there are mechanics of all kinds, some clerks, some drug clerks, others who have never been outside of a city to work. Of course they can not do the work offered them, so we are called down for offering help and then not furnishing it. The only thing we offer to do is to furnish help to farmers in the shape of men who are willing to make a try at any work given them. We have thousands of letters from farmers to whom we have sent help thanking us for having done so, but the continued 'knocking' of the bread line by certain charity workers on the lecture platform is hurting our work, for the farmers think we can only send them a lot of drunken, worthless bums, which is not the case.

"During 1908 I wrote the governor of every State in the Union, offering to supply help if he would send the addresses of farmers who wanted hands. From these letters I did not get a single reply showing that there was any great demand for farm hands."

HEARING ON IMMIGRATION BILLS.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Thursday, March 10, 1910.

The committee this day met, with Hon. William S. Bennet in the chair. Others present were Representatives Burnett, Moore, of Texas, Küstermann, Hayes, Elvins, Johnson, Goldfogle, and Moore, of Pennsylvania.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM S. BENNET, A MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

Mr. BENNET. I desire first of all to address myself to the question of where we are getting and from where we may expect future immigration. The immigration from the Scandinavian countries is no longer one of our sources and, as a matter of fact, both Sweden and Norway are attempting to get back to their own countries the peoples who have emigrated to this country from there.

Mr. HAYES. Is it not true that the wages paid to labor there are nearly as large, if not quite as large, as they are here?

Mr. BENNET. Wages have very generally increased. That is not only true of Norway and Sweden, but is also true of Denmark, another Scandinavian country, which in the last seventy-five years have become prosperous almost entirely through agriculture, and therefore with the industrial conditions as they are in those countries there is no reason to believe that the large immigration which we had from those countries some years since will be resumed. So far as emigrating populations are concerned, they can be considered as denuded, although their percentage of population to the square mile is of course very much larger than ours. There is and will be emigration from Finland which arises because of the governmental conditions in Russia. The conditions in Germany are similar to those that I have described in the Scandinavian countries. There has been a great revival in the agricultural industry in Germany, and in addition the German Government by statute and by the administration of statute discourages the emigration of its people to any except German colonies. The emigration from Germany now consists almost entirely of two classes, those who have been left behind as members of a family from previous emigration and some farmers who are taking up land in the Middle West, the immigration being about 30,000 a year.

Mr. BURNETT. In 1909 was it not 58,534?

Mr. BENNET. Those are the correct figures; you have them before you. Not an immigration large enough to consider in connection with restrictive measures, although one that would be particularly burdened by an increased head tax.

Mr. HAYES. Is it not likely that we will have quite a large immigration, larger than for some years, from Great Britain owing to the industrial conditions there?

Mr. BENNET. I am very frank to say it has been a source of wonder to me that we have not had a larger immigration from Great Britain on account of the industrial conditions, but we have not had it, and with Canada making efforts to get English-speaking people for her immigrants, if immigration starts up from there, why, the governments of England and Canada together will use their efforts and be very much more successful in directing it toward the channels of the new lands in Canada. There does not seem to have been a large industrial emigration from Great Britain, and England has not been one of our immigrant feeders in the past, and with every incentive at the present through industrial crises there the emigration does not seem to start.

Mr. HAYES. Are you stating that quite right? Of course, Great Britain has not been one of the very largest sources of our immigration, but is it not true that we have had a pretty steady flow from there for a number of years until recently?

Mr. BENNET. We have had a steady flow of some thousands. What were the figures last year, Mr. Burnett?

Mr. BURNETT. Thirty-nine thousand and twenty-one.

Mr. HAYES. I am speaking of Scotland and Wales combined with England.

Mr. BURNETT. Scotland 16,446, and Wales 1,699.

Mr. HAYES. That makes considerably over 50,000.

Mr. BENNET. But not to be compared with the streams that used to come from Germany and Ireland and now from Russia, Italy, and Austria. Then, I think, in connection with that, so far as what you might call the emigrating classes are concerned, that the passage of the new laws in Great Britain providing for old-age pensions, which take away the fear of starvation or the poorhouse in old age, will tend to keep the British subject in his own islands.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. And the same is true with Germany?

Mr. BENNET. Yes, sir; the industrial compensation laws in Germany, and there is no doubt at all that those laws will play a great part in emigration. When a man knows that in his own country when he reaches the years when he can not labor he will be taken care of, and taken care of outside of a poorhouse, and in a way that the law recognizes he has earned, he is more apt to stay in his own country.

Now, in addition to that, considering this question in connection with the restrictive measures, I have never understood that there was any desire to restrict the immigration of able-bodied Englishmen, or Scotchmen, or Welshmen.

Mr. BURNETT. Or Irishmen?

Mr. BENNET. They were not embraced.

Mr. HAYES. Or any of the Scandinavian countries?

Mr. BENNET. I have always understood that the restrictive measures were at least intended to be applied most strongly against the southern peoples and against the Jews that come from Russia and Roumania.

Mr. BURNETT. Not the Jews especially, but all the eastern Europeans, except the Finnish. Those people in northern Europe are white people and good people.

Mr. BENNET. How many Russians came in last year?

Mr. BURNETT. Russians, 10,083, and Ruthenian Russians, 15,808, making about 26,000 in all.

Mr. BENNET. Taking the immigrant and nonimmigrant both, there is practically no emigration from Russia of the Slavic or Tartar people. The emigration from Russia, which is a large emigration, is of the Jews and from the Baltic provinces and Finland, from the revolutionists who come to this country on account of government conditions.

Mr. BURNETT. The Polish are not largely Jews?

Mr. BENNET. No, sir. A good many come from Poland.

Mr. BURNETT. Seventy-seven thousand five hundred and sixty-five.

Mr. BENNET. The Poles come from Austria, Russia, and Germany—three countries.

Mr. HAYES. They are a very high class of immigrants?

Mr. BENNET. No better than the emigrants from Finland.

Mr. HAYES. They have had experience in self-government?

Mr. BENNET. The Finns would not be coming at all now if it were not for the fact that the Russian Government has obliterated their form of government, putting them on the same level as the ex-serfs of Russia. Therefore they come within our ancient and well-established rule of welcoming people who are fleeing from oppression.

I did not quite finish my statement in regard to Germany. Instead of Germany being a country from which immigrants come, it is a country to which they now go, not permanent, but temporary immigrants. The Germans have advanced very far in agriculture and for the character of their holdings and the character of their soil are probably ahead of any other people in the world. They have taken so many men from agriculture into industry that when it comes to gathering their crops they have not the men in Germany to-day to gather their crops, and so the northern Italian comes up over the southern border of Germany and harvests the crops in southern Germany and the Pole comes over from Poland—Russia—to harvest the crops in that portion of Germany nearest to Russia.

Mr. BURNETT. And as soon as they get through they go back home?

Mr. BENNET. Yes, sir. He is only there temporarily and goes back for the winter, but he is there during the harvesting season. So great has been the combined strain of America and Germany during the harvest season, on Poland, that when I was in Poland in 1907 the large landed proprietors were attempting to map out a scheme by which they could bring over the Trans-Siberian Railway coolies from China to harvest their wheat, keep them during the harvest time, pay them a mere pittance, and then send them back over the Trans-Siberian Railway after the harvesting was over. They said they could do it and harvest their crops at a price to make both ends meet. The reason that they can not pay their own people a higher price for harvesting the crops is that, being in Russia and under the Russian laws and having a Russian market originally, they have to compete, so far as the growing of wheat is concerned, with the wheat grown by the serfs all over Russia, who are practically attached to the soil, although they have been freed nominally some twenty-five or thirty years—in 1882, I think. So German immigration on a large scale is practically a thing of the past. Then, of course, you must remember that at

the time of the very large German immigration they were having their political and revolutionary troubles. When men like Carl Schurz came to this country, they came as refugees—men of 1848. Of course that is all over, and they now have a peaceful, happy, and united country.

Now, the Russian immigration, in my judgment, is due practically entirely to governmental conditions. I never realized how much difference government can make until I traveled through Russia.

Mr. HAYES. Go to Mexico and you will see the same thing just across the river.

Mr. BENNET. I do not want to quote from Mr. Burnett's report on Germany.

Mr. BURNETT. I am perfectly willing.

Mr. BENNET. Then I will quote in substance the report made by Mr. Burnett, Mr. Latimer, and Mr. Howell as to the reason why this immigration has ceased. I have the report here, and if it is desired I can put the exact language in the record. We do not realize in this country exactly what the Russian governmental conditions are. Mr. Burnett cites an instance that I had cited to me also of the way the frontier is guarded. From the Black Sea on the south to the North Sea on the north the European Russia frontier is guarded by cossacks, who are within rifle shot of each other, within sight of each other, and who are instructed if any one attempts to cross the border to shoot first and inquire afterwards. A gentleman in Germany, whom Mr. Burnett knows, but whose name I do not want to put in the record, told me that he stood on the hill at Mislowitz, where Mr. Burnett was during his trip, and saw a Russian peasant coming down the road from Russia toward Germany, and as he crossed the line a cossack rose up, armed with his rifle, and shot him. That was all there was to it. He was coming out of Russia on a public road, but was not coming through a passport station, and under the laws of Russia he was killed. Members of our Immigration Commission, armed with the highest kind of passports that the Government of the United States issues, were not allowed to step across the Russian boundary at Mislowitz, although if they had gone to a passport station they would have had no more trouble than I had. Crossing from Germany to Russia on a public road, gentlemen of evident standing and evidently strangers and foreigners whose only idea was curiosity, were turned back on a public road in broad daylight.

Mr. BURNETT. That is not exactly correct. At Mislowitz we crossed a little bridge and were met at the center by a cossack, and he showed us the line of demarcation, as much as to say, "This far, and no farther." We then drew the passports which had been viséed by the Russian consul at New York, and he permitted us to pass in. The next day, at least a day or so afterwards, we were on a railroad leading from Germany into Russia with a German guide, and we met with the same kind of a cossack—they police the whole border for possibly a thousand miles—and he pointed to the same line and waived us back. We then produced the passport and showed it to him, and he looked at it and shook his head and would not permit us to go over. It was the only country where we even had to show our passports.

Mr. BENNET. That is exterior Russia.

Mr. BURNETT. We were also told of instances where some Russians had come across to the control station for the purpose of coming to America without passports, and were turned back on account of being deserters, and when they tried to return they were shot down by the cossacks.

Mr. BENNET. That is Russia. Inside of the guard line that Mr. Burnett and I have described is another guard line consisting of mounted men who are not stationed at any particular place, but who ride up and down day and night, and inside of that, quite a distance, is another line of sentries, so that the border line of Russia is guarded by a triple line of sentinels. In addition, as I now recall, there is only one railroad with a standard gauge that goes into Russia. I think that was probably the one you were on. The gauge of the Russian railways is broader than the European railways, and consequently freight and passengers have to change cars at the frontier, except on the one road that goes as far as Warsaw, in Poland. Immediately inside of the boundary is what is known as the "Pale," and in that settlement is the only place in Russia where the Jews can live. A Jew can not live in St. Petersburg, except as the servant for some people called "merchants of the first guild." He can not live in Moscow, except as a servant of a merchant of the first guild. He can live in Kief if he is an artisan or merchant of the first guild, but even in the cities where merchants of the first guild or artisans can live they are subject to visits from the police at any hour of the day or night. So it is not unusual for a policeman to come into the house of a Jewish artisan of the high class or a Jewish merchant of the first guild at midnight when he is asleep in bed with his wife and in the midst of his family and come into his sleeping chamber and arouse him for the purpose of seeing if he is the man who is entitled to live in the house. That is the condition of the wealthier Jewish people. In the lower ranks of the Jews they are subject to persecution under that law that is hard for us to understand. They can only live in cities of a certain size, and as the law is being gradually enforced, a young man grows up and gets to the proper age and goes into the army from a place where he is not permitted to live, and when he serves his term he is prohibited from going back to the little village where he was born. They are restricted in their right to own or lease agricultural land.

Mr. HAYES. I thought they were not allowed to own any land at all.

Mr. BENNET. They are not, but I made the statement conservatively. They get around that by leasing, but even then only in a very limited way. They are restricted in the industries in which they can engage. Of course they are restricted in the free movement such as we have in this country, so that labor can move in accordance with the law of supply and demand. It is the more pitiable because Russia is an undeveloped country, with room for millions more than are there, a beautiful country. I always had an idea that it was a bleak, bare, cold, desolate country, but as I rode across it—having been born in the country and knowing something of the country—from Berditschew to Kief I stayed at the car window all day looking at as fine an agricultural country as we have in the Middle West, and if the laws were such that people could live there and develop it there would be no Russian Jewish emigrants, because it is their country.

They were there before the Christians came in. They were conquered people.

Mr. HAYES. In Russia?

Mr. BENNET. They will show you in Kief the place where the conquerors came and where the barbaric king discussed with his nobles—assistants, you might call them—what religion they should embrace, and they finally made up their minds to embrace Christianity and were all taken down to the river and baptized.

Mr. ELVINS. The Russians or Jews?

Mr. BENNET. The Tartars who came in.

Mr. HAYES. The Jew was there before the invasion?

Mr. BENNET. It goes back a great many years. Even to this day the Jews are in terror on the anniversary of the day on which the Tartars embraced Christianity and were baptized, because that is a day in the year that the Jews are apt to be massacred.

Mr. HAYES. Since you have gone into that history, would it not be well to state that before the invasion of western and eastern Russia they had a very high degree of government. You will remember that some of the cities like Kief were members of the Hanseatic League. They had self-government there about as highly developed as any country in Europe, and the Tartar invasion submerged all that.

Mr. BENNET. Yes, sir; and the Jews were there as a part of that civilization at that time. As I say, they can not progress in the industries because they are barred from the different branches of industry and from education. A gentleman at whose house I visited in Kief, who was, I presume, one of the wealthiest Jews of that place, a millionaire, desired to instruct his own son in his own business. Under the Russian law they would not allow that young man to learn his father's business, because that is now proscribed. He was a sugar refiner. He could not put his own boy in his own office to learn his own business.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Is that an enactment against the race?

Mr. BENNET. It is under what is known as the "May law," as passed in 1882.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Specifying the Jews as proscribed?

Mr. BENNET. Yes, sir; and those laws have been continued from year to year since. They were continued quite recently for another year.

Now, I was in the city of Berditschew, a city of 80,000 people, which has 80 per cent Jews. I do not think that there is anyone who will deny that the Jews in this country are industrious, that they have become prosperous and that they are progressive. I never heard it denied. In fact, one of the accusations is that they are too progressive.

Mr. HAYES. Is it not also true that the Jew is able and as a matter of fact does, even in that very uncongenial and limited environment, read and write, either in Yiddish or Hebrew?

Mr. BENNET. It depends on what you call reading and writing. I suppose the percentage of Jews, of course, they are mainly orthodox, who can not read the Talmud is negligible. That is, the male Jews, but the women can not. They have no opportunity. They are not allowed in the public schools. Education with the Jews is a matter of their own procurement.

Mr. HAYES. A family matter, largely?

Mr. BENNET. To some extent, and besides that a matter of paying taxes for the public schools for others and then paying an additional sum for the education of their own children. I want to show you what chance they have. In the first place in the city of Berditschew, with a population of about 80,000 people, where they told us that over 80 per cent were Jews, it had prior to 1882, when there was unrestricted communication, been a prosperous place. It was the only living dead place I ever was in. Industry had practically ceased. There is a little clothing business in a very minor way. There was not a well-dressed, prosperous-looking person in the whole place, as near as I could see. In that place of 80,000 people there was not a hotel where a traveler could get both a room and meals. There was one hotel where we could stop, get a room, but we had to go to another hotel for meals. We wanted to call on some people, a doctor and some others of standing, and we sent out for a carriage and we were willing to pay for a good carriage. They sent a carriage to our door that we could not go through the streets of Washington in without a crowd following with laughter and derision. I do not think it had been painted in five years. The harness was patched, the horses were old, and the driver had on a long overcoat, and if he had one patch on his coat he had a hundred. If it had not been so pathetic, it would have been indescribably ludicrous.

Mr. BURNETT. Did you not find the same condition of squalor among the natives as well as among the Jews?

Mr. BENNET. Well, in that particular city, yes; because it is very largely a Jewish city. I am frank to say that I did not go either to St. Petersburg or Moscow. Mr. Burnett did.

Mr. BURNETT. No; I only went into Russia at Mishowitz, just across the line, the place where Mr. Latimer and Mr. Howell took the line to St. Petersburg. I have only a very limited knowledge of Russia, only the country on the border.

Mr. BENNET. If there is the same degree of squalor, there is not the same reason, but there is one reason why the Jew progresses more in Russia than the muzhik. The Jew is a very temperate person; he is not a total abstainer, but he does not drink to excess.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Is it not true that in many of the places in Russia the Jew lives very temperately in a degree, while the muzhik in some places is given to drinking and exhibits all the evidences of having lived in excess and vice?

Mr. BENNET. That is the uncontradicted testimony of everyone, and when I get to Roumania I will describe the difference between the two villages, one Christian and one Jewish, that I visited.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Are you able to tell us how many Jews there are in Russia and what their proportion is to the natives?

Mr. BENNET. No one is. Like everything else in Russia, the statistics are unreliable, but their number is unquestionably much less than 10 per cent of the entire population.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. The Jewish population would be less than 10 per cent of the Russian population?

Mr. BENNET. Yes, sir; less than that.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Would that run into the millions?

Mr. BENNET. Yes, sir. There are seven or eight million Jews in Russia.

Mr. HAYES. Including Roumania?

Mr. BENNET. No, sir; there are only about 250,000 in Roumania—less than that, and about 8,000,000 in Russia.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. About 7,500,000.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Would you say that the disposition of most of the Jews there was to leave Russia?

Mr. BENNET. If the Jews of Russia had the money the immigration of Jews to this country would only be limited by the number of ships to carry them.

Mr. ELVINS. Is there any disposition on the part of the Russian Government to prevent them from leaving?

Mr. BENNET. Yes, sir; there is a disposition on the part of the Russian Government to prevent them. I do not know that I could say that there is that disposition on the part of the central government at St. Petersburg. The whole Russian Government is permeated with corruption that we can not understand. With this system that I have described, of triple guards at the frontier, of which everyone knows, 50 per cent of the Jews that leave Russia are compelled to come without passports through those three ranks of armed men.

Mr. ELVINS. Either by evasion or bribery?

Mr. BENNET. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. I would like to ask your opinion, and the question is very pertinent, I think, whether the Jews there in the congested sections, so far as you were able to observe, are rebellious as against the existing order of things in Russia or whether they have the means of putting away disaffection or whether they resist the Government?

Mr. BENNET. That is rather a double-jointed question, and I will have to answer it in several ways. The question of whether the Jews being so greatly in the minority should resist oppression is a question of policy which is discussed not only by the Jews there, but over the whole world. There are two distinct parties; one says that in the end they will wear out oppression by submission, and the other which advances armed opposition.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Is it not a fact that the large majority of Jews have not resorted to any such armed opposition and on the contrary have been very obedient to the laws and very submissive to the regulations and ordinances of the places in which they dwell?

Mr. BENNET. I think Mr. Moore's question referred more particularly to when the attempted massacres take place, whether they resist.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. I wanted to get your opinion of the attitude of these oppressed people, whether they tried to congregate and talk matters over between themselves. I want to get your opinion of their attitude under the existing Government with a view to determining what their attitude might be toward any other government to which they might go. It is a very serious question and I am putting it in the broadest possible way so that you can answer it freely.

Mr. BENNET. When I was there the Russian Government was resorting to repressive measures. Every policeman in Warsaw stood in the center of the street stock still and was guarded by two soldiers, who stood on the sidewalk on either side with rifles so no one could

kill the policeman. They were said to be arresting between 400 and 500 people a week without any warrant and putting them in jail, and they put 70 people in a room that would only accommodate 20, and where there were no sanitary facilities whatever. Now, after they had continued that for some time, they made up their minds that the city was peaceful, and so one night without any notice they took away the soldier guards of the policemen, and that night the people rose and killed 43 policemen.

In Vilna, where the Russian Government has always maintained a heavy guard, there came a governor who took just the opposite view. He sent for the leading Jews and the leading citizens, and he said: "There will be no military guard on the police. The police will not be used for anything except the enforcement of the laws against disorder, burglary, murder, etc. I am going to trust the people." They did not believe him, but he kept his word absolutely and took away all the guards. He used the police in a normal way, such as they would be used in this country, and he had absolutely no disorder. I was there during that time, and they told us that the most unpopular men in the town then were the few remaining persons who had been patriots when there was armed oppression, but who now were regarded as nuisances, because, they said, "We are getting along all right. This governor is fair, and we do not need to be stirred up." Their streets were just as calm as any place, with not an armed guard in sight, but within a very short time after that the Russian Government took away that governor and sent a governor who restored the old order, who put the guards for the police on the streets, and resorted to the same espionage system and things went right back. That is not the only example. There was a liberal governor at Odessa at one time who put down the "Black Hundred." The Black Hundred are the Russians who stir up the peasants and incite them against the Jews. They are just as much violators of the law as anyone, but they are permitted, although in their ranks are known murderers and known criminals of every description. It is from the records of the Douma that I make that statement. This governor started and put down the Black Hundred just as he would any other criminals, and the Russian Government removed him and put a governor there who allowed the Black Hundred to continue their work. That is an answer to that. Where these people are treated decently they devote their time and attention to the arts, industries, and peace. And where they are oppressed they band together, and I think that is quite natural.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Too much restriction, in your opinion, has incited rebellion?

Mr. BENNET. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURNETT. You spoke awhile ago of the opposition of the German Government to allowing them to remain in their country?

Mr. BENNET. The opposition of the German Government to the Jews?

Mr. BURNETT. The people from Russia coming over there and staying.

Mr. BENNET. There are antisemitic laws in Germany.

Mr. BURNETT. Why is it if they are quiet, good people, that under the good laws Germany has they do not welcome them to their country as citizens and let them remain there?

Mr. BENNET. I have never made a special study of the German question. I presume it is an inherited or religious question of some sort. I am frank to say that I was not detailed to Germany on our trip and that particular subject I did not go into.

Mr. BURNETT. You remember that at Breslau they had an order issued compelling them to leave.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Where?

Mr. BURNETT. Breslau, in Germany.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. They have a general law that no one is permitted to stay longer than two years unless permission is given. If I should go there I would have to have permission from the Government. That is the general law.

Mr. BURNETT. Is it not true that at a port north of Russia, where the steamship line is owned by Russian capitalists, there is rather encouragement for them to leave by that line?

Mr. BENNET. There was a fleet known as the "Russian volunteer fleet," which was owned by the Russian grand dukes and some capitalists attached to the court. It is true that if a person signified his intention to leave by that fleet he could get out of Russia with forged passports, absolutely fraudulent on their face, anything that a man can by any shadow pass him.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. "If you go by our line, we will let you out?"

Mr. BENNET. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURNETT. There is no interference by the Government?

Mr. BENNET. As long as he went by that line, he would be permitted to go. That is one of the contradictions of the Russian Government system, that while all their secret police and everything are trying to catch criminals and anarchists, as is their function, here is the Russian Government line, which is the line used by those people and unquestionably with the knowledge of the Russian officials. That is just simply a part of the corruption that covers the whole country.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Now, please give us their occupations, their means of livelihood, those who concentrate in the cities.

Mr. BENNET. They are being kept from agricultural pursuits and in consequence are being driven to be mechanics and in the industries in the cities where they can live—the mechanical industries, machine shops and everything of that sort. The artisans in those places are Jews. That is what they go into there.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Are they being prohibited from taking up agriculture?

Mr. BENNET. Yes; they are not allowed to go into agriculture.

Mr. BURNETT. Even in their own "pale."

Mr. BENNET. Yes, sir; they are compelled to live in a city or village of some size. The only way a Jew gets into agriculture is by stealth and through having a Christian as nominal owner or lessee.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Do they buy land at all?

Mr. BENNET. No, sir. A merchant of the first guild can buy land. I am not sure that he can buy agricultural land. He can buy land in the cities. They are kept by law from acquiring agricultural land.

Mr. BURNETT. Around the Black Sea a great many are engaged in farming?

Mr. BENNET. Yes, sir; through certain portions of Russia, where nearly a century ago the then liberal Czar opened tracts for the Jews,

and there are extensive agricultural settlements on those tracts, but the Jews are being slowly driven from those tracts. Every time a young man enlists in the army and goes to serve in the army, when his term of enlistment is over, he can not go back.

Mr. ELVINS. Where does he go?

Mr. BENNET. Wherever he can.

Mr. HAYES. The Jew does not go into agriculture because he does not naturally take to agricultural pursuits.

Mr. BURNETT. Even in this country.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. A large number are now taking to agricultural pursuits in this country.

Mr. HAYES. Where?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. They have even an organization of the larger farmers. They have held a fair in New York, and it was a very creditable thing indeed.

Mr. HAYES. I am not saying this in derogation, because I do not think it is.

Mr. BENNET. I think that is an error.

Mr. HAYES. I have lived among them more or less all my life and I have never known of one.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. They have even farm schools, which are well conducted.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. One of the best institutions in Pennsylvania is conducted under Jewish auspices.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Reverend Doctor Krauskopt, whom Mr. Moore knows very well, I think——

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Yes; I know him very well.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Is at the head of that institution. That farm school turns out a large number of young men well equipped to take upon themselves the varied agricultural pursuits. The Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Wilson, has highly commended that institution. He has been there. Every year there has been a number of young men who have graduated and who go out to the different portions of the country and engage in farming and who are thoroughly up-to-date in the farming industry.

Mr. BURNETT. Is that school limited to the Jews?

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. No. I know a great deal about that institution. I have been there once or twice at their commencement.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. That is not the only one; we have a number.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. As Doctor Krauskopf describes it, it is a nonsectarian school. The teachers have been Christians, but there are Jewish teachers, and the scholars, as a rule, have been Jewish boys who have been taken from the streets from the centers of population. These boys have been taught the chemistry of farming and have found lucrative positions immediately after graduation. Some of them have gone to take charge of large farms on salaries as high as \$1,800 a year at the start. It is an exceedingly creditable institution. There are other institutions of farming in our vicinity under the direction of the Baron de Hirsch fund where farming is encouraged, and to-day in the lower part of New Jersey——

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. There is a colony at Vineland.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Woodbine and Vineland, where, in addition to farming, they are engaged in manufacturing pursuits, work in the mills, and enterprises of that kind. Perhaps there have been one or two failures of colonies of this kind. I have asked Mr.

Bennet these questions with a view to ascertaining if it is his opinion that the Jews coming from such frightful conditions as prevail in Russia into a country where we are supposed to be a little more favorable in the matter of our liberty, laws, and order, if they would tend to help us in the agricultural growth of our country where we need them so badly.

Mr. BENNET. The census figures show, taking the foreigners generally, including the Jews, that the tendency to go into agriculture is increasing.

Mr. HAYES. It has been diminishing for many years.

Mr. BENNET. No.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. There are many Jewish farmers in North Dakota and South Dakota and in many of the Northwestern States, and they have done excellent farming work; even down in Texas.

Mr. MOORE, of Texas. What part of Texas?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Just that I can not tell you. They have settled down there.

Mr. BENNET. I think near Brazos.

Mr. MOORE, of Texas. I live on that river. I will tell you that there are a good many Russian Jews coming into my section of Texas, and I know at least 20 families at my own home, and they are all merchants. The natives there have no prejudice against the Jews, because they are good, law-abiding people, but they wonder why they do not go into agricultural pursuits. They are all merchants engaged in some business in the town.

Mr. BENNET. That is because they and their fathers and their grandfathers for centuries in the countries from which they came have been engaged in business.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Even the opportunity to lease land and to farm on shares has been restricted and limited in Russia.

Mr. MOORE, of Texas. I have heard the question asked why they did not go into agricultural pursuits and the native Texans say: "The Jew is too smart to take hold of the plow handle."

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. A great many of the native American farm boys prefer to leave the farms and go to the cities and engage in the city industries. That statement has been made before this committee.

Mr. BENNET. In Sullivan County, N. Y., near where I was born, there used to be hardly any Jews, but now that is very largely a Jewish farming community. It might be well to add, in passing, that the farmers who sold them their land found them very good customers at high prices. You can not tell any of the old-time Sullivan farmers that the Jew is a hard bargainer.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I take the statements as they were made by the gentlemen who appeared before this committee to argue for restrictive measures. They have time and time again developed before this committee that the tendency of the American boy on the farm now is to get away from the farm and to engage in the city activities. So we find that the native American boy who is not a Jew is as anxious to get to the city and engage in the commercial pursuits as anybody else. I have taken the statements of the gentlemen who appeared before this committee to argue for restrictive measures.

Mr. BURNETT. That is a very small proportion of those who remain.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I suppose that is so; I do not know just what it is. I take it the number must be considerable, else those who appeared

before the committee would not have used that argument. They seemed to be very frank and honest and they made the statements in good faith.

Mr. HAYES. What Mr. Moore is trying to bring out and what I would like to bring out is the fact that the American farm boy, although he goes to the city, has a sort of hunger for the country and, if he gets well to do, he will go and buy a big farm and live on it. The Jew's inclination, as I understand, is just the other way.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. He does, however, go back and, I think you will find, contributes to the improvement of the locality.

Mr. HAYES. Undoubtedly.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. In the cities where he has gone he has helped toward increased values of the real estate. A great many of those who have come from Russia and who lived under those deplorable conditions described by my colleague, Mr. Bennet, have become prosperous merchants. They have large factories, stores, employing laborers and paying good wages, and they add to the prosperity of the community where they settle. I think that will be conceded by every member of this committee.

Mr. BURNETT. The Jewish merchants are among as good citizens as we have in our country.

Mr. ELVINS. You said that you would tell us why the immigration was now going into Germany?

Mr. BENNET. Because of this tremendous increase in industry and agriculture, wages have gone up and the continuity of labor has increased.

Mr. ELVINS. Anybody else going into Germany?

Mr. BENNET. From Poland and Italy. A temporary migration to harvest the crops.

Mr. ELVINS. It is not a general stream of immigration?

Mr. BENNET. No, sir; not like to this country.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. That stream is not so to any country except to this country?

Mr. BENNET. Argentine Republic.

Mr. BURNETT. I would like to ask whether you did not find a statement made that the Germans were not coming to this country on account of the influx from the Mediterranean Sea people?

Mr. BENNET. No; I read your report, thinking I could find such a statement, but there was none.

Mr. BURNETT. I heard that statement made by individuals.

Mr. BENNET. I never heard it. I take as the basis of my statement the report made by Senator Latimer and you.

Mr. BURNETT. I do not think I signed that report. I did not sign it for the reasons I stated to Senator Latimer.

Mr. BENNET. It seems to be pretty generally conceded that there is no particular objection to the Jew. At least I heard none expressed. The Jew comes in families. According to the figures in the various reports of the Bureau of Immigration, 25 per cent of those people who are religious refugees will be shut out of our country if you pass the illiteracy provision.

Mr. HAYES. It depends on how you word that provision. I have stated that several times. If you provide that the head of the family must read, and if he has daughters or a wife who are otherwise admissible, it will not exclude them?

Mr. BENNET. Yes; you will not exclude so large a percentage. Then, if you increase the head tax to \$10, as is proposed by some of the bills here—I am not discussing those bills which propose \$50 and \$100, because those are out of the range—if you increase the head tax to \$10, what you do to a large family is this: You make a man coming here with a family because he is a refugee pay a prohibitive tax, because they have four or five children—seven or eight is not unusual—and the head tax must be paid even on the baby that is born on the ship coming over, whether they pay for the steamship tickets or not; and on the ordinary Jewish family of four or five children and father and mother you are putting a tax of \$70, whereas the man who comes for temporary work and goes back in winter simply pays the \$10, and, in my judgment, is not nearly as much entitled to consideration as the religious or political refugee who comes here with his family, because you must bear in mind this: Of course, I am a Christian and have the profoundest feeling toward my own people, but I can not but admire the constancy and fidelity of those people to their faith when I realize that all a Jew in Russia has to do in order to free himself from all these conditions is to go into a Greek Christian Church and simply say, with his lips, not with his heart, “I am a Christian,” and although of these seven or eight million oppressed people thousands are killed and more thousands are made destitute, you can almost count in any one year on your two hands the number of Jews who give up their faith and go into the Christian Church and say, “I am a Christian,” although to do so not only saves life and property but opens the door to prosperity in the future.

Mr. HAYES. Persecution has done that.

Mr. BENNET. They are not the only oppressed people. I have just as much sympathy for those who are being massacred in other countries as the Jews in Russia and Roumania. I have shown this committee before some 70 or 80 pictures that I got in Russia after a massacre there. The American consul at Mersine, Turkey, brought me the other day a picture of one of the results of the Roumanian massacres. He did not get to the scene of the massacre until six weeks after it was over and yet so numerous had been the deaths and so widespread the destruction that the unburied corpses were lying there by hundreds and thousands strewn over the grounds and the fields. I want to pass around this picture, showing a peaceful Roumanian farmer murdered in his own field.

Mr. BURNETT. By a Mohammedan?

Mr. BENNET. Yes, sir. And yet living in a land where the Government had made it impossible to learn, though they were ambitious, industrious, shrewd, and progressive. I can not vote to put up a bar against the people of my own faith and religion and keep them out of here simply because they have not had the educational privileges that I have.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. And yet we call this the age of civilization?

Mr. BENNET. So long as a condition of that kind exists, where men of my own faith and belief are being murdered by men of other faith and belief, because of their faith and belief, I will never vote to keep them out.

Mr. HAYES. We can not make the United States the harbor of refuge for all the persecuted people of the world.

Mr. BURNETT. The Christian Chinese persecuted for the same reason should be admitted for the same reason?

Mr. BENNET. I am not prepared to bar out the white Christian of my own faith simply because he has not had the opportunity in his country which I have had in this country.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. That is right.

Mr. BENNET. You say that we do not want to make this country a harbor of refuge; it has never been anything else.

Mr. HAYES. That is the way to destruction, if you pursue it to the logical end.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I think the sentiment of my colleague, Mr. Bennet, is in accord with the American spirit.

Mr. HAYES. But you can not legislate on sentiment.

Mr. BENNET. The moment we cease to legislate on sentiment in this country we begin to retrograde. That has been the history of every country.

Mr. HAYES. I had some sentiment when I went to California. If you will come out and stay with me for two months, if you do not change your mind you will be the first white man.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Are there no children of foreigners attending the schools in the congressional district represented by Mr. Hayes?

Mr. HAYES. Lots of them.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Do you not find, Mr. Hayes, that these children of immigrant parents are very bright, and after attending the school a very few months become accustomed to American habits and adopt American customs and very soon exhibit all the traits we love to see in the Americans who stand for the flag and all it represents.

Mr. HAYES. Emphatically, yes.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. That is the way in New York, Boston, and Chicago.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. And all through the country.

Mr. HAYES. I visited a school just before I came here last fall, where there were Chinese, Japanese, and Italian children; I am not going to specify any of them, but it takes them about two years to complete the same course of study that the American and Jew child will do in one year.

Mr. O'CONNELL. The young Italian children in Boston are as quick as any children ever born.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. In New York they learn rapidly and develop a remarkable degree of intelligence and come out splendid types of boyhood or girlhood.

Mr. HAYES. One of the difficulties, of course, is due to the fact that English is not spoken at home.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Do you think it is wrong for the parents to continue the German language with the children so as to give them an opportunity to learn two languages?

Mr. HAYES. I am not condemning it.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I do the same thing at home.

Mr. O'CONNELL. The mayor of Boston has just returned and is advocating teaching Spanish in all of the Boston grammar and public schools.

(Thereupon the committee adjourned to meet to-morrow, Friday, March 11, 1910, at 10.30 a. m.)

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Friday, March 11, 1910.

The committee met at 10.40 o'clock a. m., Hon. William S. Bennet presiding. Others present were Representatives Adair, Goldfogle, Moore, of Texas, Sabath, O'Connell, Küstermann, Burnett, Edwards, Moore, of Pennsylvania, and Elvins.

Mr. BENNET. This is a hearing on the House bill, arranged at the request of Judge Goldfogle, of the committee, and the speakers, unless there is objection on the part of the committee, will be called by the Judge in the order he desires.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Simon Wolf, of Washington, may be first heard.

STATEMENT OF SIMON WOLF, ESQ., OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I appear this morning representing two large constituencies, and Mr. Kohler and Mr. Elkus, of New York, have joined forces with me in representing these organizations. There is also a list of names that I have handed up, representing the American Jewish committee, consisting of Mr. Marshall, Doctor Adler, Mr. Cyrus Sulzberger, and Mr. Henry Cutler, of Providence, R. I. All of these gentlemen will have something to say, in regard not only to the pending bills, but to the general subject involving immigration from the earliest period of our country's history, and the practical effect it has had, and in regard to what has been accomplished by the legislation on the statute books, and the administration under the rules and regulations as made by the Department of Commerce and Labor.

I want it understood right in the inception that we are here, in common with all others, as American citizens. Our most sincere desire is to do that which will contribute most to the welfare of all, to uphold everything that is sacred and loyal in our institutions, to the end that the immigrants coming here, and for whom, to a certain extent, we are responsible, as far as our own coreligionists are concerned, shall be a blessing in the future as they have been a source of prosperity in the past.

I do not intend to take up the time of any of the speakers, or to dilate upon subjects that they have made a special study of. I wish to simply state that naturally I am very much interested in a subject of which I form a component part. I am an immigrant myself, and with the American committee there is a splendid object lesson in the person of Mr. Henry Cutler, a member of the Rhode Island legislature, and who has by dint of energy and great resourcefulness swung himself to the very head, not only in mercantile affairs, but in all affairs that appertain to the welfare of our country.

It would be carrying coals to Newcastle to tell an intelligent body of American Members of Congress what immigration has been. I only wish to emphasize that as far as I am concerned, and as far as those whom I represent and those who are represented by other members of the different organizations are concerned, they have but one ambition, and that is to aid the Government in the proper administration of just laws, and, at the same time, to aid the incoming immigrant to become a loyal, self-supporting, intelligent, and patriotic American citizen.

I wish to say one particular word in regard to the bureau of information, which I believe is provided for in section 40 in the present immigration law. That bureau, for some reason or another, has been somewhat crippled within the last six months by misunderstanding and misconception as to the scope of its work. Mr. Sulzberger will speak more at length on that subject, as far as his experience with removal work is concerned.

Mr. ADAIR. Will the gentleman pardon an interruption just there?

Mr. WOLF. Yes, sir.

Mr. ADAIR. The gentleman has stated that he represents some certain society, and that other gentlemen from New York represents another society. In order that we may understand what those societies are, I would like to have the gentleman state what societies he has reference to?

Mr. WOLF. I have handed the list to the clerk. Mr. Cutler and Mr. Elkus represent the board of delegates of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. I also represent the great order of B'nai B'rith, of which I am the resident member. There is also Rabbi Abram Simon, of this city, who is also a member of the board. These other gentlemen represent the American Jewish committee. I understand there are other gentlemen here to speak for themselves later.

I simply wish to state further that this bureau of information has done a vast amount of work, and good work. I came in contact with it, as I go annually to the city of Atlanta to attend a meeting of the orphan's home, of which I am a visitor. I have come in contact with people whom that bureau has sent, not only in Atlanta, but in Savannah, and in other cities in the Southwest. The bureau has, in my opinion, been the best creation of the Bureau of Immigration. It is directing immigrants to where they can find, not only employment, but congenial association. A vast amount of information is conveyed to the incoming immigrant gratuitously; he need pay nothing. The climate, the character of the people, the religion that is practiced there, whether there is a Catholic or a Protestant church, or a Jewish synagogue—all this information is given. Hundreds of letters have been received from farming interests all over the country, thanking the bureau and making inquiries. The reason that I am so particular in perpetuating and enlarging the influence of this bureau is that it aids in distributing from the congested seaboard cities immigrants who are only too anxious to be diverted, but who are ignorant of the facts, which the bureau can show adequately, and has so adequately furnished.

I wish to state in conclusion, as far as our wishes are concerned, there has been less complaint in regard to the law as it exists than there has been as to certain features of the administration. In our humble opinion many things could be done that would be conducive to the proper administration of the law without being so drastic as it is administered at present in certain directions; but that does not enter into legislation, but enters more into rules and regulations to be made by the Department of Commerce and Labor.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Wolf, our attention has been particularly directed, by a number of gentlemen who have appeared before us, to the proposition to increase the head tax and provide for a literacy test. In view of your wide experience in immigration matters I think

we would like to hear you on those two points. Would you advance your views on those two propositions?

Mr. WOLF. I am positively opposed, based on experience and observation, to an increase of the tax. I was opposed to the last increase. I do not think it is necessary or essential. The money comes out of the pockets of the immigrants, to a large extent, who have been impoverished by persecution in the land of their birth, who are seeking new homes, and who are trying to do the best they can, many of them landing with very little of the world's goods, and as an increase in the tax would come out of their pockets, and would simply be used in a direction where it is absolutely not essential—that is, the Treasury of the United States—I think that the head tax would be entirely uncalled for and unnecessary. A great Government like ours ought not to try to make money unnecessarily out of persecuted humanity. That was the only thing.

What was the other question?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. As to the proposition to provide a literacy test.

Mr. WOLF. I can only say that if the gentlemen of the committee refer to the celebrated and immortal message of President Cleveland, they will have a complete answer, far more cogent, far more statesmanlike, than I could possibly give. I know to my own knowledge that in 1848, in 1850, and 1852, when a stream of German immigrants, owing to the German revolution, came to this country, there were among them quite a number of men who have since risen to the highest dignity in our country, who could do nothing more than merely write their names, and that in Hebrew; yet notwithstanding they have come to the very forefront in all American affairs. Some of the most noted anarchists are the best scholars. It does not prove that education is a ban to the desire to destroy governments or to kill Presidents. We have had experience in that line. A tax of that kind, or a law of that kind would, in my judgment, be entirely un-American, uncalled for, and diametrically in contrast with the experience we have had with the immigration that has so far come to our country. While some of the first generation may not be up to the standard of reading Emerson, or Longfellow, or Dickens, or Darwin, yet, in their own vernacular, among their own people, they are thoroughly versed in and replete with all that is necessary to a moral and decent life, and the best evidence as to the second generation of those very people is, as some of the gentlemen here know from their own experience in their cities and towns, these immigrants from Russia and Roumania stand at the very forefront of scholarship and have won the prizes from those who have been to the manor born.

Mr. BURNETT. Let me ask you right there, are not the classes of the immigrants coming from along the borders of the Mediterranean Sea very different from those who were coming at the time you speak of, and even at the time of Mr. Cleveland's message. You speak of your people, and very properly so, but does that apply with equal force to the south Italian, and the Sicilian, and the Greek, and the Syrian, people from that section of the country?

Mr. WOLF. My own experience, of course, in that direction, is limited, but I have come in contact with many people from those countries, especially when I had the honor of representing our country in Egypt. I came in contact with a great many of those men, and while they may not have been up to the preconceived standards

of the strict restrictionists as to immigration, I think they would make very good citizens, provided always that the naturalization laws would be so made that these people could not come here for the specific purpose of being naturalized, and then, on the day after, go back to their countries, claiming immunity from the land of their birth by virtue of their American citizenship, and disregarding their obligations to this country, thus using the naturalization law as a vehicle for their own selfish ends.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Wolf, there was a suggestion made yesterday that a literacy test which applied only to the heads of families, the male heads of families, would bar out very few Russian Jews, the assertion being made—not by myself—that the heads of Russian Jewish and Roumanian Jewish families were, in almost every instance, literate, to the extent of being able to read and write some language. What is your observation as to that?

Mr. WOLF. Candidly, I do not believe there will be a single Russian or Roumanian Jew excluded on account of being illiterate, but as far as the women are concerned, I will state here that my own sainted mother was unable to read or write German. She could read her treasured Jewish prayer book, and she could write in Hebrew, and I do not know that I ever knew a better or nobler woman, and so they are, I believe, in the majority. These people, you must remember, have been restricted to a certain extent. The women in Israel have not disregarded the precept of the late President Roosevelt in regard to race propagation, and they have a great deal of work to do, and they can not indulge in the modern fads of whist and other celebrated pastimes.

Mr. BURNETT. A regulation to require them to be able to read their own language or dialect would not exclude any male heads of families?

Mr. WOLF. I do not believe it would.

Mr. BURNETT. Would it exclude many females over 16 years of age?

Mr. WOLF. I do not think it would; I do not know. But there is absolutely no occasion for it. My own opinion has always been in all matters of life to let well enough alone, and not to continually add on to laws that are already producing splendid results and have continually shown their great power for good.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. What has been your experience, Mr. Wolf, with respect to the enforcement of the immigration law?

Mr. WOLF. What do you mean by that, please?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. The enforcement of the law.

Mr. WOLF. By whom?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. By the immigration authorities.

Mr. WOLF. My own observation has been, and I have been connected with it since the Immigration Bureau has been created, that the heads of those bureaus and the administrative portion in various cities, and the head of the department, have uniformly been most courteous.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I have not reference so much to the extension of courtesy as I have to the enforcement of the law.

Mr. WOLF. I think they have enforced the law to the full extent, as far as it is permitted to them. They have exercised time and again a wise discretion, which the law conferred on them.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. The reason I asked was that before the committee it has been asserted that there was laxity in the enforcement of the law.

Mr. WOLF. I do not think there has been any laxity. If there has been anything at all in that direction it has been at times too literal a construction of the letter of the law. Possibly at times, when a heartrending case came up the necessary amount of discretion may not have been exercised, but in the main the law has been justly observed, and I, for one, having a very large experience, have no complaints to make whatsoever, because whatever I have to say has been said to the authorities in person when the individual case was before them for action.

Mr. ADAIR. Going back to the head tax, Judge Goldfogle and Judge Sabath both are very active and very earnest in their advocacy of the views that you have expressed here this morning; but in relation to the head tax, do you believe the tax should be fixed at such a rate as would cover the cost of administering the immigration laws, or should that expense be paid out of the general fund?

Mr. WOLF. I think the head tax ought to be a minimum tax. I think whatever expenses are incident to the administration of the Immigration Service should be borne by the Government, as any other branch of the Government, and whatever is realized from the head tax should go into the Treasury, irrespective.

Mr. ADAIR. Your idea is that it should not be levied with a view of covering the entire expense?

Mr. WOLF. Not at all, because that might lead to a head tax of \$20 or \$25, in the course of time. We have got to expect, by the very nature of things, a constant and increasing immigration of desirable people.

Mr. ADAIR. Would that necessarily increase the expense of administering the law to any great extent?

Mr. WOLF. Undoubtedly. When I came here forty-eight years ago we did not have such a magnificent building as this, and a large number of public buildings. The growth of the nation has made more buildings and an increased force necessary, and the expenses of running this great country are to-day four times larger than when I came here in 1862.

Mr. ADAIR. But would not this be true—the larger the immigration the less per capita the cost of administering the law? Is not that the rule in all lines of business and generally speaking?

Mr. WOLF. Yes; but there would be absolutely, in the various cities where the immigrants land, a necessity to have increased facilities for handling them, and in a thousand ways money would have to be expended that at present you have not done, to the penalty of the immigrant. If this country stands for anything, it stands to-day as the asylum of the oppressed, provided we get desirable people.

Mr. ADAIR. You understand, I was not asking this question with a view of advancing the doctrine of increasing the head tax, but with a view of trying to get some idea as to what the facts should be, and as to whether it should cover the cost and as to what the cost would be in case of increased immigration, and so forth.

Mr. WOLF. I spoke once before a committee similar to this, and I said then \$2 was ample. Four dollars is surely more than ample,

and there ought to be no legislation making immigration a crime or extorting from the poor immigrant that which he needs so sorely to found his new home.

Mr. ADAIR. I agree with you on that.

Mr. BURNETT. In regard to one other bill that this committee has had before it, I would like to have your valuable opinion. I congratulate you upon the fact that it does not apply to your people much, especially in the section of country I come from—the South. This is in regard to the deportation of criminal aliens. This committee has reported a bill recommending the deportation of criminals who, within five years after arrival, are convicted of crimes involving moral turpitude. I would like to have your opinion on that.

Mr. WOLF. Within five years?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes; convicted within five years. We do not propose to go beyond that term.

Mr. WOLF. I was not aware, of course, that you had contemplated such a bill. It seems to me that a man coming from Russia or any other part of the world, thoroughly a good man in every way, who comes in contact with our American civilization and is to be punished for that coming into contact with it, and has imbibed some of the villainies of our lower classes, that he should be punished after being here within five years, is to me certainly very obnoxious and repugnant to all my ideas of justice.

Mr. BURNETT. Do you not think that would be really to the interest of the good alien of the country, that they should be deported and gotten rid of?

Mr. WOLF. If you were going to use it in that sense, you could enlarge and do a great many other things. You might say that a woman coming here with her husband who proves unfaithful within five years and abandons her children should be deported, or the husband should be deported within five years if he does anything that leads to the destruction of the American home. You see that is legislation that cuts in many different directions. I am in favor of excluding the criminal. I am in favor of excluding those persons of three years' residence who have become inmates of public institutions. But that a man who within five years, under circumstances, possibly, that he could not prevent, should be deported when he was a perfectly sane, sound man when he landed, I can not see the justice of.

Mr. BURNETT. These are crimes, understand, involving moral turpitude.

Mr. WOLF. I understand, but there is no limit to those classes of cases. I would be much more in favor of deporting those who are born here and have had the benefit of all the good and great in our institutions, that we should have a reserved place to deport those to. [Laughter.]

Mr. BENNETT. Inasmuch as we have reported that bill, Mr. Burnett, it seems to be the sense of some gentlemen on this side of the room, at least, as long as we have not much time, to limit the discussion to the bills that are now before us.

Mr. BURNETT. I was just asking for his opinion about it.

Mr. WOLF. Gentlemen, I do not want to be the subject of criticism on the part of my colleagues. There are many valuable things to bring to your attention, and unless there is some other question to be answered I will give way. I thank you for your courtesy.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as Mr. Goldfogle has referred to the matter of illiteracy, as contemplated in the legislation asked for, I would like to call attention at this time to a communication I have received from President Eliot, of Harvard University, which seems to cover the point very fully. He goes on to say:

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *February 14, 1910.*

MY DEAR SIR: I beg leave to invite your attention to the following statement of the principles which should govern the national legislation on immigration:

(1) Our country needs the labor of every honest and healthy immigrant who has the intelligence and enterprise to come hither.

(2) Existing legislation is sufficient to exclude undesirable immigrants.

(3) Educational tests should not be applied at the moment of entrance to the United States, but at the moment of naturalization.

(4) The proper educational test is capacity to read in English or in the native tongue; not the Bible or the Constitution of the United States, but newspaper items in some recent English or native newspaper which the candidate can not have seen.

(5) The attitude of Congress and the laws should be hospitable and not repellant.

The only questions which are appropriate are, is he healthy, strong, and desirous of earning a good living? Many illiterates have common sense, sound bodies, and good characters. Indeed, it is not clear that education increases much the amount of common sense which nature gave the individual. An educational test is appropriate at the time when the foreigner proposes to become a voting citizen. He ought then to know how to read.

Very truly, yours,

CHARLES W. ELIOT.

Hon. Jos. F. O'CONNELL,
House of Representatives.

(Other letters received by Representative O'Connell follow:)

NOTRE DAME, IND., *February 26, 1910.*

The Hon. JOSEPH F. O'CONNELL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'CONNELL: In reply to your request for an expression of my views on the subject of immigration and naturalization, I desire to say that I am well pleased with the present laws relating to the exclusion of undesirable immigrants.

I am not in favor of any educational test as applied to immigrants desiring to enter the United States, though an educational test is entirely proper before naturalization. It is not advisable to insist on ability to read the English language, however, before an immigrant can be naturalized.

I am strongly in favor of excluding from this country all immigrants who profess the doctrines of anarchy.

Very sincerely, yours,

JOHN CAVANAUGH, C. S. C.,
President.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,
February 28, 1910.

Hon. JOSEPH F. O'CONNELL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your favor of the 23d instant was received. I am not in favor of the restriction of immigration on the basis of the ability to read some European language. There is no doubt that the ability in question is desirable. At the same time, the conditions of workingmen in the old country and their conditions in our country are radically different. If they are industrious and honest and thrifty they will make useful citizens, and their children, having the opportunity of attending our free public schools, will acquire the needed education. In my opinion the requirements for naturalization ought to be made more strict, and at that point it might well be that an intelligence requirement should be embodied. A man should not become a citizen of this country and thereby, as under the laws of most of our States, entitled to the suffrage, unless he has a fair understanding of the nature of free government.

Very truly, yours,

HARRY PRATT JUDSON.

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY,
Washington, D. C., February 28, 1910.

Hon. JOSEPH F. O'CONNELL,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Regarding the educational test as a means of restricting immigration, on which question there is an agitation to report out a bill, I beg leave to submit the following:

- (1) The educational test should be applied to the voter, not to the immigrant.
- (2) The laws restraining immigration are sufficiently drastic, and, if put into execution, will safeguard the country. Those who have openly taught immorality and favored anarchy should be excluded rather than the illiterates.

An illiterate artisan is not necessarily an ignorant or undesirable immigrant. Our whole past history proves that such men may serve the country in their proper sphere.

Very truly, yours,

JOSEPH HIMMEL, *President.*

CORNELL UNIVERSITY,
Ithaca, N. Y., March 4, 1910.

DEAR SIR: I have your communication of February 23, with the inclosed copy of the letter of ex-President Eliot, of Harvard University, on the subject of the admission of immigrants into the United States.

I fully concur in the views expressed by President Eliot, and I do not think I can express them in clearer, more forcible, or appropriate language.

Very truly, yours,

J. G. SCHURMAN.

Hon. JOSEPH F. O'CONNELL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

BOSTON COLLEGE,
Boston, Mass., February 25, 1910.

Hon. JOSEPH F. O'CONNELL,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. O'CONNELL: I am pleased to know that you are a member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, because I think that you can render the country effective service. The proposed educational test seems to me to be a fatal mistake.

(1) Does not the country need the toil of every intelligent, active, and moral worker who comes to us?

(2) The proper time for the educational test is when the immigrant seeks to be naturalized.

(3) Let existing legislation be enforced before new laws are enacted. The wise regulations already made, if enforced, would bar out undesirable subjects.

(4) There are millions of acres in the West waiting for these farm-loving immigrants. I am sure that you will insist upon these truths.

Ever yours, sincerely,

T. I. GASSON, S. J.

I have letters of the same tenor from President Schurman, of Cornell; from President Gasson, of Boston College; from the president of the University of Chicago; from the Rev. John Cavanaugh, the president of Notre Dame University; from Rev. Joseph Himmell, of Georgetown University. They are all more or less of the same tenor, and I believe I should not take the time of the delegation in having them read, but I will ask to have them put into the hearings and incorporated as part of this hearing.

Mr. BENNET. Unless there is objection, it will be so directed.

Mr. BURNETT. I will ask, then, in the same connection, to have a statement that was filed with the Immigration Commission, made by the American consul at Messina, stating that he thought the educational test was the only effective way of dealing with the question, attached to the hearing.

(The statement follows:)

After nearly thirteen years' residence in Sicily, during which period I have tried to study the emigration question in all its phases, I have arrived at the conclusion that both Italy and America would benefit by its restriction; the fields of the former that now lie fallow, for lack of labor to cultivate them, would become productive, and the prisons and reformatories of the latter would not be overcrowded by a class of foreigners whose treacherous characteristics are such that a special arm of the detective service had to be created to keep them in check. It is said that the emigrant from upper Italy is sober, industrious, and makes a good citizen. I fear that the same can not be said of the one from Sicily or Calabria. The money he earns never sees the light of day after it finds its way to repose between the filthy linings of his leather wallet. His living expenses are about 40 cents a day, and the hogs in an American farmer's pen are more cleanly in their surroundings and habits than are he and his dozen associates who huddle together in one room and exist like animals, not human beings. When the wallet is well swollen he puts the contents in a registered letter and sends it to his relatives here, who change it into Italian currency and deposit it in the post-office bank. * * *

Sometimes instead of sending it he brings it himself. In that case he appears upon the scene with a flashy suit, a top hat, a filled chain, and a brass watch, and struts among his former associates—a second Gulliver, a giant among pigmies. In a few weeks he returns, having induced some of his friends to accompany him. Immigrants of other nationalities, even the Polish Jews, spend their money where they make it, but the Sicilian and the Calabrese never. The only persons to whom their advent is a benefit are those who employ them at a cheaper figure than they would have to pay for American labor.

To at least check the constant rush of those people to our shores, I see but one remedy—the insertion of the illiteracy clause in the immigration law. This would oblige about 85 per cent of the class to devote their attention to the developing of the industries of their own country, which sadly need the aid that we are only too glad to dispense with.

STATEMENT OF CYRUS S. SULZBERGER, ESQ., OF NEW YORK CITY.

Mr. SULZBERGER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I want first to correct Mr. Wolf on the matter on which he did not have the data before him. I find by reference to the report of the Commissioner-General of Immigration that of the number of Hebrews over 14 years of age who could not read and write in the last year 16 per cent of males were included in that category and 30 females.

Mr. BENNET. So that 16 per cent of the male Hebrews who came last year would have been excluded under a literacy test?

Mr. SULZBERGER. Yes. Before taking up the question generally, I want to call attention to an interesting point in connection with white slavery.

Mr. BENNET. In connection with that, I would like to ask you, so as to resolve an apparent conflict, is it not a fact that most of the orthodox Jews have a knowledge of the Talmud, which might be called a literary qualification?

Mr. SULZBERGER. I do not know, Mr. Bennet, whether they understand when they are asked whether they can read or write, if their ability to read the prayer book or the Talmud is such qualification, and they answer no when they are quite capable. I think the percentage is larger than it should be, and that it is due to that cause.

I desire to draw the attention of the committee to the reference in the report of the commissioner-general on page 117, dealing with the subject of white slaves. I desire to point out that so far as white slavery and its attendant evils come to us by immigration, such immigration is only in very limited degree from Europe, but is

chiefly from this continent. The total number of persons debarred from entering because of prostitution or procuring is 504. (Report of commissioner-general, 1909, pp. 80, 81.) Of this number 279 were from Mexico, who sent us 11,000 immigrants over 14 years of age, and 225 were from the rest of the world, which sent us 651,523 immigrants over 14 years of age. (Commissioner-general's report, p. 22.) Of the 225 coming from Europe who were debarred, the distribution was as follows:

French, 37, or 19 per 10,000 over 14 years.
 Scotch, 19, or 13.7 per 10,000 over 14 years.
 English, 39, or 11.7 per 10,000 over 14 years.
 Irish, 21, or 7.2 per 10,000 over 14 years.
 German, 31, or 6.4 per 10,000 over 14 years.
 Dutch and Flemish, 4, or 6.3 per 10,000 over 14 years.
 Hebrew, 15, or 3.5 per 10,000 over 14 years.
 Italian, 22, or 1.3 per 10,000 over 14 years.

It will thus be observed that so far as the European immigrant of this undesirable class is concerned, it is greatest among those classed by the restrictionists as desirable and least among those classed as undesirable. Furthermore, it is observable that the Hebrews and Italians (which of the Europeans have the largest percentage of illiterates) have the smallest percentage of these miscreants, while the French, Scotch, English, Irish, and German have a much larger percentage. It is also observable that the amount of money shown (commissioner-general's report, p. 23) is least among the Hebrews and Italians and greatest among the others. It would therefore appear that so far as white slavery is concerned, neither the illiteracy of the immigrant nor his lack of funds has any bearing.

I want now to direct your attention to the subject of criminality, and to call attention to an extraordinary blunder made in the report of the Commissioner-General of Immigration for the year 1904, in which, on page 59, he gives the total population of the United States as 75,994,575, and the total alien population of the United States as 1,001,595. That is the report of the year 1904, referred to in the current report; the report for the year 1909 refers to the report for the year 1908; the report for the year 1908 refers back to this table in the report of 1904. I find, according to the census report of 1900, volume 1, part 1, page 209, that of male aliens there are 1,004,217; that is to say, there are more male aliens of voting age than the commissioner-general gives of total aliens. In addition thereto there are foreign-born persons as to whom it is not known whether they are alien or citizen, 748,506. Ignoring entirely all the female aliens of any age, and all the male aliens below voting age, we find that there were more male aliens of voting age than the total number of aliens upon which the whole table of statistics as to criminality and dependency is built up, and its use in 1904 is repeated in 1908 and 1909. I have made some investigations on my own account upon this subject, and in view of the fact that there are 75 per cent as many persons of voting age——

Mr. BENNET. Before you leave that point, could you, if it is not difficult, put in the record where that is?

Mr. SULZBERGER. Page 59 of the report of 1904.

Mr. BENNET. Of the current report?

Mr. SULZBERGER. I haven't the page, but I will have it in a moment.

Mr. BENNET. Very well.

Mr. SULZBERGER. Since there are 748,000 persons as to whom we do not know whether they are aliens or citizens, but we do know they are foreign born, it has seemed to me that it would be wiser to deal with the question of foreign born rather than with the question of citizenship, inasmuch as if the man is to become a dependent or a criminal, he is just as apt to become so if he has taken out his citizenship papers as if he has not. I find, then, dealing with foreign born rather than with aliens, in the special reports issued by the Census Bureau (United States Census Report on Prisoners and Juvenile Delinquents in Institutions, 1904), it is said, on page 18:

If the general population of all ages be taken, the basis for comparison will not be equitable for several reasons. Inmates of the general prisons are all at least 10 years of age and nearly all over 15. For the most part the immigrants are between 15 and 40 years of age. The number of children under 10 years of age is extremely small among the white immigrants as compared with the native whites. In view of these facts, a comparison of the proportions of each nativity class in the white prison population with the corresponding proportions of the general population of all ages would clearly be unfair, for the inclusion of children under 10 years of age would so increase the proportion of native in the general population that it would seem as if crime were more prevalent among the foreign born as compared with the native white than is actually the case. Therefore children under 10 years of age are omitted, and the figures given for the population in Table 7 refer only to those at least 10 years of age. Even with this exclusion the figures are, on the whole, less favorable to the foreign-born white prisoners than the facts warrant, as no account could be taken of the large immigration between 1900 and 1904.

And on page 19 this report says:

The figures presented above give little support to the belief that the foreign born contribute to the prison class greatly in excess of their representation in the general population.

In the Census Report on Population, volume 2, pages 112 to 117, it appears that the total foreign-born population 15 to 19 years of age is 563,527. The total foreign-born population being 10,460,085, we find that of the foreign-born persons, 5.4 were between 15 and 19 years of age, whereas of the foreign-born persons committed to prison during 1904, 4.6 were from 15 to 19 years of age, showing that there were fewer persons from 15 to 19 years of age, foreign born, committed to prison than their percentage in the population.

The Industrial Commission Report, volume 15, part 2, page 287, calls attention to the fact that criminality is 3 to 5 times greater in males than females, and that persons under 20 seldom commit crime. Taking, therefore, male persons 20 years of age and upward, we find by the 1900 census, Population, part 2, pages 112 to 116, that there are 26 per cent foreign-born whites and 74 per cent native-born whites 20 years of age and upward. Turning to the report on prisoners, page 40, we observe that of the major offenders committed during 1904, 21.7 per cent were foreign born and 78.3 per cent native born, notwithstanding the fact that the percentage of foreign-born adult males is 26. That report says, on the same page:

The foreign born do not contribute to the white major offenders above their representative in the general population at least 15 years of age, except in the two Southern divisions, where they are comparatively unimportant. In the Western division, and more especially in the North Central, the proportion of foreign born is considerably lower among the white major offenders than in the white general population. Among the white minor offenders the proportion of foreign born is generally higher than among the white major offenders, and in the North Atlantic, South Atlantic, and Western divisions exceeds the proportion of foreign born in the general white population. In the North Central division the foreign born contribute 23.3 per cent of the general

white population at least 15 years of age and only 21.3 per cent of the white minor offenders. From these figures, as well as from those for the prisoners enumerated on June 30, 1904, it is evident that the popular belief that the foreign born are filling the prisons has little foundation in fact. It would seem, however, that they are slightly more prone than the native whites to commit minor offenses. Possibly to some degree this is attributable to the fact that the foreign-born whites are more highly concentrated in urban communities.

Turning to New York State, which has the largest foreign population (Census Report, Population, vol. 2, pp. 112-116), we find that the number of males 20 years of age and upward in New York, native born, is 1,362,300; foreign born, 844,563, or native born 61.7 per cent and foreign born 38.3 per cent. In the Special Report on Prisoners, page 18, Table 7, we find that of the white prisoners enumerated in New York State on June 30, 1904, 68 per cent were native born and 32 per cent foreign born, the foreign born contributing, therefore, six thirty-eighths, or about 16 per cent less than their ratio in the community, and in view of the fact that 38.3 per cent of the adult male population of New York is foreign born, the statement made by the superintendent of prisons and quoted by Mr. Burnett (hearings, p. 41), as to 25 per cent of the prisoners in Sing Sing, Auburn, and Clinton, is favorable to the foreigners rather than otherwise. It must always be remembered, too, that the census figures are of 1900 and the report on prisoners of 1904, there being no allowance made for the number of foreigners who came into the country in those four years.

Interesting, too, is the following from page 18 of the Special Report on Prisoners:

Even the North Atlantic States, which have absorbed most of the late immigration, show a larger percentage of native prisoners than in 1890. It is evident therefore that the huge recent additions of foreigners to the population are not reflected in the prison returns in the degree the prison statistics of 1890 might have led one to expect.

And on pages 19-20:

Certain offenses, especially some comprehended under the general group "against society," are not crimes in the true sense of the word. For instance, no less than 4,701 prisoners were sentenced for drunkenness, 2,773 for disorderly conduct (which is often only another term for drunkenness), 4,287 for vagrancy, and 709 for violating liquor laws, but it does not by any means follow that all these persons, or even a majority of them, should be described as criminals.

There were, in 1890, 28.3 per cent foreign-born prisoners and 71.7 per cent native born. Comparing this with the figures for 1904, we find that there were 23.7 per cent foreign born and 76.3 per cent native born, showing a decline of foreign-born prisoners between 1890 and 1904—precisely those years that are coincident with the large immigration of the so-called undesirable classes.

From page 14, "Report on prisoners," the following figures are taken:

Number of prisoners per 100,000 population in 1890 and 1904.

	1890.	1904.
New York.....	191	126
Pennsylvania.....	123	92
Illinois.....	102	60
Massachusetts.....	233	187
New Jersey.....	169	131

These 5 States, which have the largest proportion of immigrants, all show decreases, whereas substantial increases are shown in New Hampshire, Vermont, West Virginia, Florida, Kansas, Wyoming, and Washington, where the immigrant population is small.

In the hearing given by this committee Mr. Patten, a representative of the Immigration Restriction League, spoke of the fact that 21 per cent of the foreign-born prisoners were unable to read and write. I want to point out that this in itself shows nothing.

Of the native-born prisoners, only 7 per cent were illiterates and 93 per cent were literates, and the argument might be made that literacy causes crime. The fact is that the entire foreign population as shown by the statistics reported in the volume on prisoners is less prone to criminality than the native. Instead of its being true, as Mr. Patten says, that "statistics show, as one would expect, that it is the illiterate who generally has criminal propensities," statistics show that of the more than 3,200,000 white illiterates in the whole country the total number of white illiterate prisoners was about 6,000.

Therefore, to draw any wild inference as to illiteracy generally showing criminal propensities, is a mistake, not being borne out by the facts.

Mr. BENNET. From what source do you take those last figures you quote?

Mr. SULZBERGER. These are also from the census report, and this special report on prisoners.

Mr. Patten also says, on page 69, that the literacy test is proposed merely as a means of sifting out the unassimilative elements. What constitute the unassimilative elements does not appear, but if the ability to read and write in the second generation is any test of assimilativeness, it would seem that all the foreign elements assimilate without delay. We find by the census report (Population, Part 2, Table 10, p. 106) the following percentage of illiteracy:

	Native whites of native parents.	Native whites of foreign parents.
United States.....	5.7	1.6
North Atlantic.....	1.7	1.5
South Atlantic.....	12.0	2.1
North Central.....	2.8	1.3
South Central.....	11.6	6.8
Western division.....	3.4	1.3

So that in every separate division the illiteracy is greater among native-born children of native parents than it is among native-born children of foreign parents.

Mr. BURNETT. That is from the census of 1900?

Mr. SULZBERGER. It is from the census of 1900, and I have already given the page.

Mr. BENNET. And refers exclusively to white persons?

Mr. SULZBERGER. Refers exclusively to white persons, and it would seem, therefore, that the immigration raises our educational standards instead of degrading them.

On page 50 of the hearings Mr. Patten quotes the report of the commissioner at Ellis Island as follows:

Between these elements—

The very bad—

and those that are a real benefit to the country, as so many of our immigrants are, there lies the class who may be called able to earn a living here but who in doing so tend to pull down our standards of living.

These elements are presumably such as the commissioner-general in his report speaks of as “economically undesirable,” and which under that heading are added to the excluded classes in the Elvins bill. I have seen no definition of what constitutes “an economically undesirable” immigrant, but I assume it to be one who arrives without much money and with a physique that would not qualify him for the United States Army, as is proposed also in the Elvins bill, and who is, to a considerable degree, illiterate. If that be the correct description, the average Jewish immigrant would probably fall under that heading. The conditions under which he has lived and from which he is fleeing have restricted his educational possibilities, his physical growth, and his accumulation of wealth. He comes here with a large percentage of illiteracy, a physical development somewhat below our own and a depleted purse, and he shows a considerable degree of illiteracy. Large numbers of such Jewish immigrants have arrived in this country since 1880. So far, however, from pulling down our standards of living, they have done the reverse.

The men's and women's clothing industry is one which is almost exclusively in the hands of these immigrants, both as employers and employees, and gives us, therefore, an almost perfect illustration of their influence upon industry and their tendency to reduce or elevate the standard of living. We find by the Census Report on Manufactures (part 1, 1905, p. 234, Table 169) that while the product of all industries increased from \$11,411,000,000 in 1900 to \$14,802,000,000 in 1905, an increase of 29.7 per cent, the clothing industry increased from \$436,000,000 in 1900 to \$604,000,000 in 1905, an increase of 38.5 per cent; in other words, while in 1900 clothing formed 3.8 per cent of all industries, in 1905 it formed 4.1 per cent of all industries. Only last month a clothing manufacturer from New York returned from abroad, having established agencies in London, Paris, Berlin, Vienna, Brussels, and other cities for New York made clothing. This is the second or third manufacturer who has recently put American-made clothing into European markets and in all likelihood a large foreign commerce in manufactured clothing, the product of immigrant labor, will ensue.

Mr. ADAIR. Let me ask a question right there. Do you know of your own knowledge whether the manufacturers insisted upon a tariff upon manufactured clothing for the purpose of protecting them from these people abroad?

Mr. SULZBERGER. Insisted upon what?

Mr. ADAIR. The levying of a high tariff upon manufactured goods to protect them from these same people they are now competing with?

Mr. SULZBERGER. I suppose they did; I am quite sure of this, that they will take advantage of the rebate provision in our tariff

law to enable them to get a reduction of the duty they paid. [Laughter.]

Taking the Special Census Reports on Manufactures (part 1, 1905, pp. 164-168) we find that in the production of \$604,000,000 worth of clothing there was paid for wages to men the sum of \$60,943,153, or an average of \$601 per capita against an average earning of men in all industries of \$534 per capita (same vol., p. 22) and to women \$46,864,351, or an average of \$317 per capita, as against \$298 per capita earned by women in all industries.

Mr. BURNETT. Is that from the industrial commission's report?

Mr. SULZBERGER. No, sir; from the census report of 1905 on manufactures, the latest volume on that subject. Inasmuch as the 147,000 women engaged in the clothing industry are earning 6 per cent more wages than women in all industries, and the 101,000 men engaged in this industry are earning 13 per cent higher wages than the men in all industries, it would seem so far as this industry is concerned, the industry almost monopolized by immigrant labor, as though immigrant labor were advancing rather than lowering the standard of living. Furthermore, between the census of 1880 and the census of 1905 we had the period of high immigration of the so-called "undesirable classes." In 1880 the average wages in all industries were \$344; in 1905 they were \$477, an advance of 39 per cent in the twenty-five years of high immigration.

Mr. BENNET. Is it not a fact, Mr. Sulzberger, in connection with that, that the industry which used to be almost exclusively Jewish, the clothing industry——

Mr. SULZBERGER. Is now becoming Italian, but it is foreign just the same. Much concern is expressed about the cost to the country of maintaining foreign-born dependents. I do not suppose anybody will charge Mr. Prescott F. Hall, secretary of the Immigration Restriction League, with being too friendly to the immigrants. I am going to read you an extract from his book, *Immigration*, commencing on page 67:

In estimating the money value of the immigrant, attention may first be called to the fact that the bulk of our immigration is of the age of greatest productiveness; that is to say, this country has the benefit of an artificial selection of adults of working age. For example, in 1903, less than 12 per cent of all immigrants were under 14 years of age, leaving more than 83 per cent between the ages of 14 and 45. In other words, the expense of bringing up the bulk of our immigrants through childhood has been borne by the countries of their birth or residence, and this amount of capital therefore comes to us without expenditure. Professor Mayo-Smith refers to the frequently quoted estimate of Frederick Kapp that the cost of bringing up a child to the age of 15 is \$562.50 in Germany and \$1,000 to \$1,200 in the United States. Taking the value of the immigrant at \$1,000 the immigration over 14 years of age in 1903 would have added \$754,615,000 to the wealth of the United States if it had all remained in the country. A thoroughly conservative estimate is probably that of Mr. John B. Webber, formerly Commissioner of Immigration at the port of New York. He assumes that there were 10,000,000 foreign born at the date of the Eleventh Census, and that 2,000,000 of these were working at an average wage of \$1 per day; and he points out that these persons added \$600,000,000 per year to the earnings of this country.

Taking these figures, we find that the immigration of a single year adds \$754,000,000 to the wealth of the country by a saving in the cost of the upbringing of the immigrant and that the industrial activity of the immigrants adds \$600,000,000 annually to the earnings of the country. In view of this statement we need not concern ourselves very much with the fact that a small percentage of immigrants become dependents. That the amount of dependency among

immigrants should be larger than among natives is perfectly natural; they are engaged in those occupations in which they are subjected to the risk of physical injury, and being in a strange land when they fall into distress, they lack friends or relatives to care for them.

In view of the fact that the immigrant brings in \$750,000,000 as new capital, and adds \$600,000,000 annually to the product of the country, it seems to me that what it costs to maintain those in public institutions, who may happen to fall into public institutions, becomes negligible.

Another statement that has been made, quoted by Mr. Patten—frequently quoted—is that of Gen. Francis A. Walker, a statement quoted with approval by Mr. Prescott Hall, that the foreign immigration does not add to our population, but that it simply supplants native population; that when they come in by Ellis Island they do not come in by the natural route. Mr. Hall says in his book, on page 117:

In many of the older countries of Europe the birth rate has continued with full vigor. In the country from which there has been a considerable emigration, the birth rate immediately increased to such a degree the pressure of population is soon restored to its former condition.

As a matter of fact, it is a universal symptom—there is not a single exception—that the birth rate nowhere increases, but almost everywhere decreases. The Encyclopedia of Social Reform, of 1908, page 117, gives a comparative statement of the birth rates in the various countries of Europe.

(The table referred to is here printed in the record in full as follows:)

Country.	1857-1899.	1900.	S. J. 1.
Austria.....	38.0		1903 35.0
Belgium.....	30.1	28.9	1903 27.5
Denmark.....	31.3	29.8	1904 29.2
England and Wales.....	32.3	28.7	1904 28.0
France.....	23.7	21.4	1904 20.9
Germany.....	37.2	35.6	1904 34.1
Hungary.....	42.9	39.3	1903 36.6
Ireland.....	23.8	22.7	1904 23.6
Italy.....	36.6	32.9	1903 31.5
Norway.....	30.7	30.1	1904 27.9
Prussia.....	37.7	36.1	
Scotland.....	32.2	29.6	1904 28.6
Spain.....	a 35.6	34.4	1902 35.6
Sweden.....	28.7	26.9	1903 25.7
United Kingdom.....	31.1	28.2	

a 1888-1899.

At the hearing on February 22, Mr. Gardner, of this committee, is quoted as saying:

The greatest experiment in distribution that has been made was that made by the State of South Carolina. They received 762 immigrants from Berlin and Belgium and other places, and the result of that experiment was that within a year out of the 762 immigrants all but 72 had disappeared from the State and had gone elsewhere.

Mr. Prescott F. Hall, in a recent letter, speaks of the distribution as being "a bluff on the part of the Jews and the steamship companies."

Mr. BENNET. Although, incidentally, Mr. Hall did not know the section of the law it was, and referred to it as section 26, when it was section 40.

Mr. SULZBERGER. That was not the only misstatement Mr. Hall made.

Both Mr. Hall and Mr. Gardner are mistaken. "The greatest experiment in distribution" was not made by the State of South Carolina, but by the Industrial Removal Office, of New York City, an organization with which I have the honor of being connected for the last nine years and of which for a considerable time I was the president, and its work is no bluff. According to the latest report of this office, there have been sent from New York 45,711 persons, of whom 24,123 were breadwinners, the remainder being their wives and children. These 24,123 persons represented 221 occupations, and were sent to 1,278 cities and towns, and the 3,500 distributed in 1909 were sent to 298 cities and towns. These persons have been distributed to all parts of the United States, towns, and villages, as well as cities, and, according to the records of the office, 85 per cent of the breadwinners are engaged in gainful occupations at the places to which they were sent.

Mr. EDWARDS. Were these immigrants sent to these towns and cities on a request of the towns and cities, or what is your manner?

Mr. SULZBERGER. Our manner is this: These persons are distributed through the cooperation of friendly committees in the receiving places, excepting where the receiving places are small. Where we send a larger number we have a reception committee, if I may so call it, to whom we send these people, not in response to immediate requisition, but from a general knowledge of the conditions as to what kind of working men they can use, and we send such classes of workmen as may be useful in the particular community.

Mr. EDWARDS. Then, taking a town or city of, say, 10,000, the committee there are the only ones who are consulted, and not the city itself, as to whether they are in need or desire these immigrants?

Mr. SULZBERGER. I do not quite understand how one could consult the city excepting through a body of individuals there. The body of individuals we consult is the local committee we have.

Mr. EDWARDS. About how large is that committee?

Mr. SULZBERGER. From 3 to 5 or 7 persons, as the case may be.

Mr. EDWARDS. Are they generally connected with the city administration?

Mr. SULZBERGER. Oh, no; these are public-spirited citizens of standing in the community, members of the Jewish community in the locality, who are interested in the work. You understand, this work is confined to the distribution of Jewish immigrants.

Mr. EDWARDS. Do they take any steps to ascertain whether the city desires these immigrants or not before they make the request?

Mr. SULZBERGER. They know perfectly well that they are able to place them; otherwise they would not ask us to send them. You readily see that if they were to load themselves up with persons for whom no work was findable, they would have upon their shoulders the moral responsibility and the actual responsibility of caring for those people and making dependents of them. I have come in con-

tact with many philanthropic persons in the course of my work, but I have not found them so philanthropic that they advertise for trouble in that precise fashion.

Mr. EDWARDS. In what sections of the country do you find the greatest demand for these immigrants?

Mr. SULZBERGER. In 1909 we sent 3,504 breadwinners, of whom 33 went to the New England States, to 11 cities; 401 to the Middle Atlantic States, 78 cities; 254 to the Southern States, 51 cities; 2,123 to the Central States, 126 cities; 680 to the Rocky Mountain and Pacific States, to 32 cities; and 13 to Canada, to 3 cities.

Mr. EDWARDS. May I ask what you mean by "breadwinners?"

Mr. SULZBERGER. People who are competent to engage in gainful occupations.

Mr. EDWARDS. Able to earn their living by manual labor?

Mr. SULZBERGER. I happen to have here the occupations of the 24,000 who were distributed between 1902 and 1909. They were engaged in 221 occupations; 9.97 in wood working; 9.17 in metal working, all classified here according to the various branches of metal and wood working.

Mr. BURNETT. Do you mean those were the occupations they engaged in after they reached their destinations?

Mr. SULZBERGER. No, these were their trades when they sent them away.

Mr. EDWARDS. How many of them were engaged in merchandizing?

Mr. SULZBERGER. We will get to it in a moment. I have the whole statement here. Eight hundred and thirteen in the building trades; 0.93 in printing and lithography; 20.86 in the needle industries, clothing, and millinery supplies; 6.99 in leather; 0.77 in tobacco; 1.95 in miscellaneous, such things as album makers, bed-spring makers, bristle workers, being only a few of a kind; 1.52 non-manufacturing—barbers, bartenders, bottlers, canvassers, cleaners, dyers, cooks, domestics, firemen, and so forth; men without trades, 31.65.

Mr. BENNET. Of 1 per cent?

Mr. SULZBERGER. 31.65, being in numbers 7,637. Of that number 7,328 were unskilled laborers and 309 were peddlers. That is the question you put to me awhile ago.

Mr. EDWARDS. Three hundred and nine?

Mr. SULZBERGER. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. Out of a total of how many?

Mr. SULZBERGER. Out of a total of 24,123. 1.74 farming; 3.36 small dealers in foodstuffs, bakers, brewers, butchers, confectioners, distillers, and so forth, making the number 809, out of 24,000. 3.6 is office help, professional, and so forth.

Mr. EDWARDS. In a great many towns, especially in rural districts to the South, it is very common of late years to have a bunch of peddlers, running from three to perhaps as many as a dozen, dropping into a little town, and immediately follows a lot of cheap goods; and they always have a correspondent or a backer in New York City on whom they can draw, and from whom they have letters of recommendation and credit to the bank; and they engage in this peddling business over the country for a few months, and then all at once they disappear and settle down in another place. I would like to know if that class of immigrants have any connection with this distribu-

tion that you speak of or if your distribution has anything to do with that class?

Mr. SULZBERGER. No; our distribution has nothing to do with this class. I said awhile ago that of the breadwinners whom we sent away 85 per cent are engaged at the places to which we sent them. Of the remaining 15 per cent some go to other places, about 3 per cent drift back to New York, 12 per cent get to other places and into other occupations, some of those, no doubt, into peddling. I have no knowledge about that, because after we have lost sight of them in the place in which we originally place them we do not know what has become of them, but we do know—we have the records to demonstrate—that 85 per cent of them are engaged at the job in which we succeeded in getting them occupation.

Mr. EDWARDS. It is true you did send out three hundred and some odd peddlers whom you knew to be peddlers when you sent them?

Mr. SULZBERGER. They were qualified to be peddlers and nothing else, apparently.

Mr. EDWARDS. They engaged in this occupation with the pack on their shoulders, carrying it through the country?

Mr. SULZBERGER. A perfectly decent and honorable occupation.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am not questioning it at all.

Mr. SABATH. Would it be possible for any of these new arrivals, not familiar with the English language, to go through these various States or districts that the gentleman refers to and sell any goods without being acquainted with the English language?

Mr. EDWARDS. I will say, in answer to the gentleman, that we have some Syrians through the South who do not have to be in this country very long before they can go out through the country and sell goods. Some of them are very nice gentlemen, too.

Mr. ADAIR. I would like to ask this question as to this particular point: Has your association or organization made any special effort along the line of inducing immigrants to engage in farming; and if so, what success have you met with along that line?

Mr. SULZBERGER. This organization was originally a branch of the Jewish Agricultural and Industrial Aid Society, of which for a number of years I was president, and I am now on the board of directors. That society engages in placing Jews upon farms. I do not like to speak of figures without having the figures before me, so I will not mention figures at all.

Mr. ADAIR. In a general way, what has been the success?

Mr. SULZBERGER. My friend Mr. Cutler, here, will be in a position to tell you something about the abandoned farms of New England which the Jews have made to flourish once more, and we have farmers in pretty nearly every State in the United States. We began a year ago the publication of the Yiddish Farmer, a farm journal in the Yiddish language, which has a subscription list, although it is only a year old, that many older established papers would be glad to have—a paid subscription list—and the Jewish farmer is in every respect able to hold his own along with any other, and is showing a very strong tendency and desire to get to the farm. I received only this week, from Doctor Sauls, in Chicago, whom Mr. Sabath will know——

Mr. SABATH. And Doctor Levy, who has devoted nearly his entire time to this work.

Mr. SULZBERGER. In addition to the society with which I am connected, there is a similar society in Chicago, the American Agricultural Aid Society, and it does similar work.

Mr. MOORE. You might tell them also of Doctor Krauskopf.

Mr. SULZBERGER. Doctor Krauskopf is conducting a farm school, where he is turning out trained agriculturists, and the Baron de Hirsch fund has a similar school at Woodbine, N. J., where they are conducting a similar work; also turning out trained agriculturists. The Government has taken from that school a large number of experts for its agricultural service all over the country. There is a greater tendency toward farming on the part of the Jewish people than there has ever been before.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Will you tell me this: What is the disposition on the part of immigrants to accept suggestions from your committee as to where they should go?

Mr. SULZBERGER. As a rule a man who comes here, and to whom one section of the country is like another, is naturally perfectly indifferent. Sometimes he comes to us and says, "I have a friend in Omaha. Will you send me there?" And if there is no reason why we should not, we are perfectly willing to do as he prefers. But as a rule a man who comes here is a stranger, to whom Omaha and Oskaloosa are alike, and he is quite indifferent as to where we send him.

Mr. O'CONNELL. What I am driving at is this: Do you find on the part of the newly arrived immigrants a desire to accept the judgment of your committee as to what is the best place for them to go?

Mr. SULZBERGER. Surely, we do find that.

Mr. O'CONNELL. That is widely spread among them?

Mr. SULZBERGER. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. As I understand this distribution you refer to, your organization made a distribution of about 3,500 during the last fiscal year?

Mr. SULZBERGER. Thirty-five hundred during the last calendar year.

Mr. BURNETT. That is, your association. Is that any argument in favor of the Government making any such organization?

Mr. SULZBERGER. Surely; I was just coming to that.

Mr. O'CONNELL. I would like to say, for the benefit of those who may possibly feel that they are obliged to leave before the hearings are concluded, that the interests of the Hebrew immigrant have been most splendidly protected by the consistent efforts of Judge Goldfogle and Judge Sabath. Both these gentlemen have shown themselves at all times warm, sincere friends of the immigrant, and their intelligent efforts to prevent any hostile legislation have been a source of gratification to every friend of liberal immigration on this committee. Nothing that can be said here to-day can improve upon their efforts. I am sure that every member of the committee will agree with me that we have been helped very materially by the constant and sincere attention which Judge Goldfogle and Judge Sabath have given to the hearings of the committee.

(Thereupon, at 11.55 o'clock a. m., the committee took a recess until 2 o'clock p. m.)

AFTER RECESS.

At the expiration of the recess the committee resumed its session, with the following present: Representatives Bennet, O'Connell, Küstermann, Sabbath, Burnett, Moore, of Pennsylvania, Goldfogle, Moore, of Texas, and Adair. Mr. Bennet presided.

STATEMENT OF MR. CYRUS L. SULZBERGER—Continued.

Mr. BENNET. You may proceed, Mr. Sulzberger.

Mr. SULZBERGER. You asked me this morning where, in the current report, reference was made to the table of statistics based on the blunder of which I spoke. On page 6 of the report of the Commissioner-General of Immigration for 1909 this appears:

When the penal, reformatory, and charitable institutions of the country were canvassed in 1908, a number of interesting and significant facts were disclosed. On this subject the following is quoted from last year's report (pp. 96 and 97):

"The last investigation of this kind was made in 1904. (See pp. 48-76 of annual report for that year.)"

That covers the page from which I quoted this morning.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Moore, of Pennsylvania, desires to ask you some questions, Mr. Sulzberger.

Mr. SULZBERGER. Very well.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. I would like to ask you to state the name of the association to which you referred this morning—the one you represent.

Mr. SULZBERGER. In the distributing work?

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. SULZBERGER. The Industrial Removal Office, of New York.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Is that organization sustained by voluntary contributions?

Mr. SULZBERGER. That organization is sustained by the funds of Baron de Hirsh, who left a large fund for the amelioration of the condition of the Russian and Roumanian Jews.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Is the Woodbine Colony, of New Jersey, under your direction?

Mr. SULZBERGER. No; it is not under the direction of this office; but it is also sustained out of the same general fund.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. I happen to live in a congested part of the city of Philadelphia.

Mr. SULZBERGER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. You have given very great attention to the question of distributing immigrants of the Jewish faith?

Mr. SULZBERGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. It has been stated before this committee that the tendency of the Jew immigrant is to remain in the congested centers and that he fails to distribute himself over the country, particularly in that he fails to take up agricultural pursuits or those outside of the congested centers. I want to know whether you have, beyond what you said this morning, found it possible to ameliorate this condition, if it is objectionable, in the large cities?

Mr. SULZBERGER. Our experience in New York, as Judge Goldfogle and Mr. Bennet know, is that whereas a few years ago we had one Jewish quarter, we now have many. The Jews who come to us from

Russia have a natural tendency to live together, because they wish to live where their language is spoken. But they do not all live in one part of the city by any means. We have a large Jewish settlement on the lower East Side, we have a large Jewish settlement in Harlem, we have a large Jewish settlement in the Bronx, and several large Jewish settlements in Brooklyn. I believe that the amount of congestion on the lower East Side of New York is to-day less than it was eight or ten years ago because of this spreading. The same thing is true about the Italians. They have spread over various settlements, instead of being concentrated in one.

Mr. BURNETT. You mean settlements in the same city?

Mr. SULZBERGER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. But they do take to the farm quite extensively?

Mr. SULZBERGER. Yes; the Italians do.

I want to call attention to a matter in connection with the congestion that is generally overlooked, and that is this: While in the large cities there is always a state of more or less congestion, the persons involved are not the same persons. In other words, a man who comes to the city of New York and who settles down on the lower East Side stays there three or four or five years. After the lapse of a few years he moves on and comes up into the Harlem settlement. From there he goes to the Bronx, and presently he is on Fifth avenue.

Mr. BENNET. In other words, as he becomes better to do he moves out of Mr. Goldfogle's district and up to mine?

Mr. SULZBERGER. Precisely; and changes from a Democrat to a Republican. [Laughter.]

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. You are usually correct, but in this instance I think you are incorrect.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. I know that Mr. Bennet is very proud of the Jews who live in his district, and certainly Judge Goldfogle is very proud of those who live in his; and there has been no disagreement, so far as I have observed, as to their politics or nationality. I want to ask you what you do, in your benevolent work, toward inducing these unfortunate people who come from Russia to accommodate themselves to the conditions that prevail in this country. That is to say, what you do toward having them naturalized, and making them better understand the laws and conditions that prevail here, which we assume do not sometimes prevail in Russia?

Mr. SULZBERGER. On that subject Mr. Marshall, one of the directors of the Educational Alliance, will give you far more precise information than I can, because that falls within the scope of the work he is engaged in.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. You, yourself, would not encourage a continuance for a longer period of time than is advisable, of the publication of newspapers in the Jewish language in the United States, or the continuance of this concentration which means the keeping up of the customs of the old country, with the quiet teachings of rebellion, at least, against the law?

Mr. SULZBERGER. I would like to have the question read to me.

(The reporter repeated Mr. Moore's question.)

Mr. SULZBERGER. So far as the foreign newspapers are concerned, there is the Staats-Zeitung, in New York, for example, which has been going on for I do not know how long, and which was founded by

Oswald Ottendorfer, and conducted by Herman Ridder. While I do not read it, I do not know but that it has as much influence for good in the community as any newspaper that is printed there. I do not read it, and so, of course, do not know.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. It certainly has.

Mr. SULZBERGER. I say, I do not read it, and I do not know. Neither do I read the Yiddish newspapers, and so I do not know about that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am not taking sides in the matter. I am merely asking you your opinion, and am seeking information, valuing your opinion as a matter of information.

Mr. SULZBERGER. As to whether the foreign newspapers should be continued?

Mr. BENNET. Not that, as I understand it, more than as an incident; but whether, in your judgment, a condition in which these people do not Americanize ought to be continued, or whether a condition ought to be encouraged in which they will Americanize?

Mr. SULZBERGER. They Americanize so fast that you can not hold them back.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Moore was asking your opinion as to whether that ought to be so or not.

Mr. SULZBERGER. You can not prevent their Americanization. They go along at the most wonderful rate. So far as their reading foreign newspapers is concerned, it does not seem to me that that at all interferes with their Americanization. A man's thought may be thoroughly sympathetic with our American thought, and yet he may express it in another language. I do not know why a man who reads a German newspaper or an Italian newspaper or a Yiddish newspaper should not think along American lines as well as if he expresses himself in the English language.

I want to read a letter written by a Hebrew lad of 13 years, who had been only six months in the country. It was written in school under the eye of the teacher, who handed it to me as a marvelous production; and I think it is.

(The letter follows:)

Only a man that was born in Russia and lived there can have the right idea of the great difference between living here and in Russia. To have the right idea of it, I'll write how my friend lived in Russia and how he lives here now.

My friend was a man who lived in a land where he had no liberty. This country was Russia. He could only live in certain parts of his native land, and even in those parts he could not live in the country, but had to reside in the gloomy, small, and unhealthy towns. None of the high careers of life was open to him. He could not become a doctor or a lawyer or a professor. He could not be an officer in the army, though he was obliged to serve in it. He could not send his children to good schools, and he could not even worship God in the way in which he had been taught by his father. Whatever he did, he had to get permission of the police to allow him to do, and very often he had to pay the policeman for the permission. Whenever he gained any money the police would be sure to find it out and get some of it from him by threatening to interfere with his liberty. Therefore it is no wonder that he regarded the Government of his own country as his natural enemy and every policeman as a master whom he must obey.

Now, my friend was fortunate enough to get away from his fatherland and come to this country where all is freedom. He can dress as he likes, do what he likes, and worship God in his own way, providing that he does not interfere with the lawful doings of his fellow-citizens. Instead of trying to thwart him on every step, the Government of his new country tries to make it easy for him in every way to be a good citizen. The police instead of being his masters are his servants, ready to help him in all that is lawful.

So my friend thought to himself how best to prove his gratitude to the new country which had treated him so well. "I will try," said he to himself, "to imitate whatever is good in the lives of my new fellow-citizens, to show how proud I am that I belong to them and how much I enjoy the new liberty that I have gained. I will no longer hate the Government, but obey its commands willingly, since I am sure they are laid down for the good of all of us. The policeman I will no longer regard as an enemy, but as a friend and do his biddings as I would follow any piece of friendly advice. My children I will teach what an advantage it is to live in this land as compared with the one in which I was brought up. In this way I shall love this land, and my gratitude and very love shall be the return for the kind treatment we receive here."

I wish that all that suffer there should become so fortunate and happy as my friend. But at the same time I wish that Russia shall get on the way of progress and succeed and to be able to compare itself with every civilized and well-governed country in the world, so that its citizens should not be compelled to come here to find liberty, which they will then find in their own country, in Russia.

PAUL GENDEL.

JANUARY 18, 1906.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. That is a very remarkable and illuminating letter, especially in view of the fact that it was written by a child of that age.

Mr. SULZBERGER. That lad was 13 years of age, and had only been six months in this country.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Yesterday afternoon Mr. Bennet, of New York, the acting chairman, described the conditions as he found them in Washington while acting as a member of the Immigration Commission of the United States; and I asked him then in regard to the sentiments of the Jews in Russia, who congest there very much as they do here, presumably for reasons of protection; and he said there was to some extent a spirit of quiet resistance to authority.

Mr. BENNET. In Russia?

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. In Russia; yes. Which, from the viewpoint of anyone who seeks information upon the subject and who understands the conditions that prevail there, would be wholly justifiable. I am endeavoring to ascertain from you whether you do anything, with regard to these immigrants who come with that feeling of impatience at the intolerance of the government under which they have lived, in the way of attempting to change that inborn spirit when they arrive in this country and again concentrate here.

Mr. SULZBERGER. That spirit does not come here with them when they come here. There is no reason for our doing anything to endeavor to counteract that spirit. It no longer exists when they arrive here. Here they are loyal, law-abiding citizens. There is no cause for our doing anything to endeavor to counteract any spirit of anarchy.

Mr. BENNET. Possibly I can illustrate that to my colleague by a story from actual experience. There were a mother and her two daughters who were driven from Odessa, as the result of one of their "pogroms." The son lived in my district. He sent them money and everything. As soon as they escaped their house was burned and their furniture was destroyed, and they crossed the Russian frontier in a very wretched condition. He sent them money as soon as they could communicate with him, and they came to the United States. They were detained at Ellis Island because one of the daughters was clearly inadmissible. He fixed up a very pleasant flat for them up town, and went down to see them, and he apologized to his mother for having to leave her in the detention quarters at Ellis Island. She said, "You do not have to apologize. This country is better than

Russia." So that is the feeling they bring with them, that even a jail, to that extent, in the United States is better——

Mr. SULZBERGER. Than their freedom, which is a jail.

Mr. BENNET (continuing). That the freedom of a jail is better than the terror of the alleged freedom in Odessa.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Still seeking information, and merely for the purpose of obtaining your opinion, I call your attention to the fact there have been some strikes recently in this country, strikes of those whom you classed a little while ago amongst the Jews who were engaged in one very large industry—that of making clothing, making shirt waists, etc. There was a large strike, a general strike, of the shirt-waist makers. There is another large strike on in my city now, a very serious one. It is sometimes complained that the trouble is accentuated and encouraged through the lack of knowledge upon the part of the newly arrived foreign born, of existing laws and conditions of the country, and that some of the feeling of resistance which comes from the oppression abroad crops out in this country, and thus makes unnecessary trouble for the law-making body and for the constituted authority, and tends to encourage a socialistic spirit here. I wanted to ask whether you, in your association, which is philanthropic and benevolent and extremely useful, had ever given consideration to this question?

Mr. SULZBERGER. So far, Mr. Moore, as the recent shirt-waist strike in New York is any indication, there were there, if the newspapers are to be trusted, some 30,000 persons out on strike. It was, in the main, a strike that was conducted without any defiance of law. So far as the records show there were a number of arrests made, it was claimed, for picketing, and for obstructing the highways in the course of picketing; but apart from that, a kind of scratching and pinching picketing——

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. SULZBERGER. Which was incidental——

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. It was characteristic.

Mr. SULZBERGER. That was incidental to the fact that the strikers were ladies. [Laughter.] Apart from that there does not seem to have been any violation of the law that is at all commensurate with what is going on in the city of Philadelphia at the present time. I read in last evening's paper a list of indictments that have been found by the grand jury in connection with the present Philadelphia strike, and I noticed with a good deal of interest that the preponderance of the names, so far as names are an indication, are of the Anglo-Saxon type and not of the foreign type.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. I am free to admit that very many Anglo-Saxon names have appeared in the list of those who have been arrested, but there have been quite a number of foreign names.

Mr. SULZBERGER. Undoubtedly there have.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. There have been a number of arrests due, in my judgment, to ignorance of the law and of the conditions that prevail in this country and perhaps to a lack of proper teaching or training upon the part of somebody who might have led these people in a different direction and might have separated them in some such way as to have relieved the authorities of the pain of putting down an insurrection.

Mr. SULZBERGER. I am rather inclined to think that it is due to the contagious mob spirit which affects all human beings alike, and has all through history, when a number of men get to walking together shoulder to shoulder. It is a spirit that is in all men, no matter how perfect they may be or what conditions they have lived under.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Is it not reasonable to suppose that if the immigrants newly arrived in this country, which is vast in its area, were scattered somewhat and scattered over sections where they might be useful in agriculture or in other pursuits, and deprived of the daily and nightly intercourse which simply reminds them of the old conditions that prevailed in Russia, it might be better for us all?

Mr. SULZBERGER. That depends on whether the growth of cities is an advantage or a disadvantage. The greatness of the city of New York has been brought about by its immigrant population. If we had no immigrant population in New York perhaps it might be better upon some sides, but it might be worse upon other sides. That is a large question to decide here.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that your work, as the representative of a great benevolent society, and that of these distinguished gentlemen here to-day, many of whom I know and appreciate and value highly, and of such organizations as the United Hebrew Charities of my city—a most creditable thing—would be much less, and that your expenses would be reduced, if you could induce the newly-arrived immigrants to separate and to go into other sections of the country rather than to remain in the alleys and by ways of the city?

Mr. SULZBERGER. Undoubtedly if there were no Jews in New York who could be removed to the country the Industrial Removal Office would go out of business; and undoubtedly, too, if there were no poor Jews in New York and Philadelphia, the United Hebrew Charities of these cities would go out of business.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. And your responsibility would be less.

Mr. SULZBERGER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. And therefore you would approve of such instruction and distribution if it could be effected?

Mr. SULZBERGER. Within limits. I would by no means approve of sending all of the Jews, or all of the immigrant Jews, of New York out of there. I am an immigrant—not an alien immigrant—but an immigrant from Philadelphia. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Just now you might very well have some of them sent elsewhere.

Mr. SULZBERGER. I should not like myself to be sent from New York.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. No; because you have made that your home and you have succeeded there.

Mr. SULZBERGER. But, do you not see, Mr. Moore, hundreds of thousands of men have made it their home. When I arrived in New York I had what was left out of \$25, after paying my railroad fare from Philadelphia to New York. I have succeeded in making good to a reasonable extent. Hundreds of thousands have come from Europe who have made good in the same way, and it would have been a fatal blunder to have sent all these men off on the farms or to other

parts, when they were fitted to work out and have worked out their salvation and economical success, and have done it right there in the city of New York. I appreciate the difficulties and dangers of congestion. I do not suppose that any man appreciates them any more than I, because I have spent a great deal of time in the study of that matter, but we must not get hysterical about it, because those men who have gathered there have made that city great, and are making it greater day by day. It is the greatest city in the country to-day, and in a short time it will be the greatest city in the world. If you say to the immigrant population that it must no more go there, but must scatter through various parts of the United States, it would be good for the various parts of the United States, but it would be bad for New York.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. I am somewhat glad to hear you say that, because I have done everything that one Representative in Congress could do to have some of that immigration come to my city of Philadelphia. It seems to me a wise thing to have it distributed along the coast.

Mr. BURNETT. I would like to ask you——

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. I want to ask you, before Mr. Burnett takes up his question——

Mr. BURNETT. It is along that same line. I would like to know the proportion in New York City of alien population. First, the number?

Mr. SULZBERGER. I do not know it, and I would not like to guess at it. I could look it up in the census report, but I do not happen to have it here.

Mr. BENNET. It would be incorrect now, anyway.

Mr. SULZBERGER. Yes; because that was in 1900, and it would be 10 years old. There must be 38 per cent, in New York State, foreign born—you mean that, too?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. SULZBERGER. Thirty-eight per cent foreign born in New York State, and there must be over 50 per cent in the city of New York.

Mr. BENNET. I can contribute this fact. The city is divided into police precincts. In each police precinct in old New York the majority of the heads of families are foreign born. That was the information up to within the last year.

Mr. BURNETT. But that does not mean Greater New York.

Mr. SULZBERGER. Manhattan and the Bronx.

Mr. BURNETT. Have you any idea as to what it is in Greater New York, Mr. Bennet?

Mr. BENNET. I would not want to say that with attempted accuracy, because I have no statistics since 1900.

Mr. BURNETT. Is it a fact, Mr. Sulzberger, that there are many of those people in the settlements where the foreigners are congested, who have been here for years and have not learned to speak English?

Mr. SULZBERGER. I do not believe that is a fact. I do not know, but I do not believe that is a fact. That there are some I have no doubt, but when you say "many" I do not believe that is the fact.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. May I answer that, for your information?

Mr. BURNETT. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. There are communities in Pennsylvania known as the Pennsylvania Dutch, who have been there for two hundred years, and who still speak the foreign language.

Mr. BURNETT. But they can speak English?

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Oh, no.

Mr. SULZBERGER. No.

Mr. BURNETT. But English is taught in the schools, is it not?

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. They are the native-born people, on the farms.

Mr. BURNETT. Does not your State require the English language to be taught in the schools?

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Oh, yes; in the public schools.

Mr. BURNETT. Do they not go to the schools?

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Yes; they go to the public schools.

Mr. BURNETT. Do they not learn English there?

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. You have me as to that.

Mr. ADAIR. I would like to ask a question in this connection. What effort, if any, does your society make toward inducing immigrants of your nationality to learn as quickly as possible the English language and to read the English newspapers? I am mentioning this for this reason: It occurs to me that one of the first duties devolving upon an immigrant is, if possible, to learn to speak the English language and to read the English language, and it occurs to me that it would be time well spent if your societies would encourage the reading and speaking of the English language and the reading of the English newspapers. Do you not believe that is one of the duties that they owe to this Government, as English-speaking people? Do you not believe that a foreigner coming here owes it as a duty to this country to learn, if possible, to speak the English language and to read the English language? The point I am getting at is this: If, for instance, a large percentage of immigrants of your nationality are able to read both in English and in your own language, do you not think it is well to encourage them in reading the English newspapers rather than newspapers printed in your own language?

Mr. SULZBERGER. Let me set you straight. Yiddish is not our own language. English is my language, and the language of most of my associates.

Mr. ADAIR. But you understand what I am getting at.

Mr. SULZBERGER. Yes. Yiddish is one of the languages of the immigrants; but the immigrant frequently speaks Russian, German, or some other language, as well.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. At this point: Is it not a fact that in the city of New York a large number of foreigners go, very soon after their arrival in this country, to the evening schools?

Mr. SULZBERGER. I was just going to speak of that.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Is it not a fact that they go to the evening schools, of which there are many in our city, and that they very soon acquire a knowledge of the English language, of writing and reading, and become acquainted with the use of English within a comparatively short time after they arrive?

Mr. SULZBERGER. That is quite true, Judge Goldfogle; and in addition to that Mr. Marshall will deal with that subject, I have no doubt, because he is more competent than I to speak of it, and it comes

within the scope of the work he is doing along educational lines in that direction.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. When I speak of the foreigners going to the evening schools, I have reference to foreigners who work during the day.

Mr. SULZBERGER. Adult foreigners.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Yes; laborers, and other wage-earners who go to the night schools and spend their evenings there and acquire a knowledge of English.

Mr. SULZBERGER. They acquire a remarkable knowledge of English; and the children, mark you, after being in school less than six months write English as well as do the native Americans.

Mr. ADAIR. The point I was making was, whether or not it was a good idea——

Mr. SULZBERGER. It is done to the utmost. Not only that, but I want to say that the records of the Carnegie Library on the lower East Side of New York shows the largest percentage of high-class literature read from that branch of any library in the city of New York. I am sorry I did not bring with me the library statistics upon that point; but I did not think the hearing would take that turn.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I would like to say that I am trying to encourage my children to read the German papers instead of the English papers, because they have a pretty fair education in English, and I do want them to continue the German.

Mr. ADAIR. That is all right.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I do not believe there is any harm at all in the children continuing the language of their parents.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Of course the children of English parents are now studying the Spanish language?

Mr. ADAIR. This is what brought it to my mind. Not long since I was in a grand lodge meeting of a certain secret society, and the question came up as to whether the ritual of the society should be printed in various languages, English, German, and all along the line. There was one German, Mr. Küstermann, who was one of the most entertaining and most intelligent gentleman I ever listened to, who took the floor and made a very strong appeal against printing the Knights of Pythias ritual in any other than in the English language.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. That was perfectly proper.

Mr. ADAIR. And he said in his argument that he believed the first and foremost duty a German owed to this country in coming here was to learn to speak and to read the English language, and that he came to this country to do that.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. It is one of the rules, is it not, that they must speak English in the Knights of Pythias?

Mr. ADAIR. No; that is not the rule at all.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. But they could not understand the proceedings if they did not?

Mr. ADAIR. The strongest argument in favor of printing the ritual in one language was made by this German, this man born in Germany, who had come to this country; and he made the strongest plea for having it printed in English.

Mr. O'CONNELL. You would not have them forget their language, or the language of their forefathers, would you?

Mr. ADAIR. No. Why do we go to school to learn to speak French and other languages? We do it because it is of advantage to us to do it. What I mean is this: If a number of foreigners come here and they settle down in a community, they should become Americanized in every way possible, no matter whether they are Germans or Jews. They ought to learn to read the English language and to speak the English language. They do not need to forget their own language to do it.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Some of the best English scholars in Boston to-day are among the Hebrews who have arrived in the last twenty years. They are among the finest scholars in Harvard. There is no doubt but that the Hebrew children very quickly acquire an intimate and fluent knowledge of English.

Mr. ADAIR. Surely they do.

Mr. O'CONNELL. I would like at this time to introduce into the record a telegram that I have just received, which is as follows:

BOSTON, MASS., *March 11, 1910.*

Congressman JOSEPH F. O'CONNELL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

United congregations of orthodox Jews in Boston earnestly oppose restriction immigration bills. Please use all efforts in opposition.

ISAAC HELLER, *President,*
3 Lawrence Park, Roxbury.

I would like to say here that I am using all the efforts I know how to use and will be only too glad to continue in that line.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. And those efforts have been well directed.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. In the bill H. R. 13404, which we are now considering, under section 2 the list of persons to be excluded from the United States includes "all aliens over sixteen years of age, physically capable of reading, who can not read the English language or the language of some other European country," etc.

Mr. SULZBERGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. I want to ask your opinion as to the wisdom of admitting common laborers into the United States who could not comply with the educational test as provided in this bill.

Mr. SULZBERGER. I think that if we had not the laborer, irrespective of his ability to read, we would find great difficulty about getting our heavy work done.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Do you understand that there is a demand for common labor in the United States to-day?

Mr. SULZBERGER. Oh, I am convinced of it.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. To what extent is there such a demand?

Mr. SULZBERGER. As I am able to make it out, it is tremendous.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. In order that the record may be illuminated to this extent: How far does your information go as to the requirements of the mines——

Mr. SULZBERGER. I do not know about that.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. And the farms and the factories, with regard to unskilled labor such as might be debarred by that provision?

Mr. SULZBERGER. Statistically, I can not answer that; but in a general way, from my observation of the matter, I am convinced

that with all the immigrants we have we are not to-day responsive to the demand for labor.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Assuming that trouble might ensue in this country in the way of riots, in the way of the performances of the Mafia, or of the Black Hand, or any other illegal secret society, have you information to indicate whether the men composing such societies and performing such illegal acts, who are foreign born, belong to the educated classes, those capable of reading and writing, or are those who have not the education that would enable them to come in under that bill?

Mr. SULZBERGER. I do not see how a man could send a Black Hand letter if he could not write. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. I wanted to find out some of your reasons for opposing this provision.

Mr. SULZBERGER. At first blush it may seem strange to you, but it is, unfortunately, a true statement. There does not seem to be any relation between crime and education.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Would you regard a man who could not read, but who came here with an honorable purpose to better his condition and that of his family, as a dangerous person to be admitted into the United States——

Mr. SULZBERGER. On the contrary.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania (continuing). Because he could not read?

Mr. SULZBERGER. His inability to read does not, to my mind, in the least lessen his value to the country.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Is it your opinion that the shrewd man who can read and who is capable of concocting schemes and conspiracies and arranging plans to violate the authority and the law, is a dangerous person to be admitted?

Mr. SULZBERGER. My information is that 93 per cent of all the prisoners, according to the prison statistics in this country, are literate, and that 7 per cent are illiterate.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Then it is your judgment that the illiterate well-meaning man who comes for the honest purpose of bettering his condition, is a desirable immigrant and therefore ought to be admitted because he is less dangerous than the man who is better educated than he?

Mr. SULZBERGER. No; I would put it in this way. There is no connection between illiteracy and crime, and the fact that a man is illiterate should not weigh either for or against him in admitting him to the country. There may be other reasons for debarring him, but illiteracy is not one of them, because there does not seem to be anyone that I can find anywhere who says there is any connection between illiteracy and crime.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. I am not stating my judgment.

Mr. SULZBERGER. I understand that.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. I am seeking yours. You are satisfied that there is a demand in this country for common labor, such as might be unable to read and write?

Mr. SULZBERGER. Absolutely.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. You are satisfied that such immigrants as come from Russia and Roumania, very largely due to the

oppression existing there, would be desirable as common laborers in this country if they could not read and write?

Mr. SULZBERGER. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. And this belief of yours would hold good with relation to other nationalities?

Mr. SULZBERGER. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Italians and others, coming in now?

Mr. SULZBERGER. Oh, yes; absolutely. I want to call attention to one other thing that I think has not had sufficient attention. It seems to me that one of the greatest and perhaps the greatest problem this country has to deal with, is capable of being solved by liberal immigration. I refer to the negro problem. The whole tendency of immigration has been that the immigrant pushes away the less thrifty, the less industrious. The immigrant pushes him up if he is capable of being pushed up, or pushes him aside, as the case may be. If we could introduce into the Southern States south Italian immigration, people who have been accustomed to a warm climate, and put them at the work the negro is doing, the negro population now concentrated in a few States would, of necessity, be scattered over the entire United States, and would become an infinitesimal percentage of the whole population, instead of being, as in some places they are, a majority in the places in which they are congested; and it would solve the greatest problem our country has to deal with. I think if gentlemen will give attention to that they will find that there is possibly there the solution of a very grave problem.

Mr. BURNETT. Let me state right there that many of the mine operators and furnace operators would rather have a negro than the south Italians as laborers. There is this difference: The negro does not want to work continuously, like the Italian. He wants a day or two or three days off after he gets his money, so that he can spend it; but as to the amount and quality of work which they can do, they will tell you that the negro is better than the south Italian.

Mr. SULZBERGER. My experience with southern employees is not large, but so far as it goes I have been led to believe that they were not very well pleased with the class of uneducated, unskilled labor that they were dealing with. Is there anything else?

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. You see no danger, then, from the admission, as it is now permitted under the existing law, of those immigrants who come into this country and who are unable to read and write?

Mr. SULZBERGER. On the contrary. I do not say, alone, that I see no danger. I put it affirmatively. I see vast benefit to the country in the admission of all immigrants not now debarred, and perhaps in the admission of some who are, not righteously, debarred.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. We are very much obliged to you.

STATEMENT OF MR. LOUIS MARSHALL, OF NEW YORK, N. Y.

Mr. MARSHALL. Gentlemen, the question was asked by Mr. Moore as to what was being done in the city of New York by the Jewish organizations and other organizations with regard to the education of the immigrant. I am a member of the board of directors of the Educational Alliance, and have been for about fifteen years. That

organization was formed for the Americanization of the immigrant. That is its principal purpose. The extent to which the work of the Educational Alliance is carried on is evidenced by the fact that during the last four or five years the number of visitors who have come to the building for the purpose of getting instruction has averaged about two and a half million a year. That is an indication of the extent to which that work is carried on. The work consists largely in instructing the immigrant as to the duties of American citizenship and as to the resources of our country, and I would like to read for your information from the report of the commission of immigration of the State of New York, of which I have the honor to be chairman, one of the appendixes which shows the various subjects which are discussed and lectured upon with respect to American history and civics in the Educational Alliance:

1. The American character: An exposition of the characteristics of the American.
2. American ideals: An exposition of the American ideals of work, civil liberty, equal rights, religious liberty, universal education.
3. Ideal government: Embodying the ideas of liberty and law. A popular exposition of the Anglo-Saxon conception of government, of liberty, and law.
4. The beginnings of American liberty: Showing the reasons for the triumph in America of the English and their political ideas.
5. Periods in American history: Colonization. Illustrated.
6. Franklin and life in the colonies.
7. Washington and the American Revolution.
8. Jefferson and the Declaration of Independence.
9. The making of the American Constitution: Showing how and why the American nation was formed.
10. The American Constitution: The relation of the state and nation; amendments and Bill of Rights.
11. American Government, city, state, and nation: A general survey of the three kinds of government. Illustrated.
12. The American Constitution: Congress.
13. The American Constitution: The President.
14. The American Constitution: The courts.
15. The American press and public opinion.
16. The American educational system and ideals.
17. The growth of America under the Constitution. Illustrated.
18. Lincoln and the abolition of slavery. Illustrated.
19. Geography of the United States. Illustrated.
20. Economic conditions of the United States as compared with Europe.
21. The development of the West. Illustrated.
22. Life of the Jews in the United States, in the South and the West. Illustrated.
23. Jewish farming in America. Illustrated.
24. American public problems: The state and the nation.
25. American public problems: The government and the party.
26. American public problems: The citizen.
27. American public problems: The state and the city.
28. History of the city of New York.
29. Government of the city of New York.
30. Ideals of American citizenship.
31. The duty of the foreigners to America.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Pardon me, but what application has this?

Mr. MARSHALL. This is to answer your question as to whether or not the Jewish organizations——

Mr. SULZBERGER. Mr. Adair asked the question.

Mr. MARSHALL. It is to answer the question as to whether or not the Jewish people in the city of New York were instructing foreigners who came there as to the duties of American citizenship, and what they were doing toward assimilating them into the body of American citizens.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. And these are the subjects that are taught?

Mr. MARSHALL. These are the subjects that are taught and lectured upon by some of the ablest men in the city of New York. The lectures are first conducted in Yiddish, so as to enable those who are unable to understand English to understand the subjects in the earlier stages. Then the lectures are delivered in English, accompanied by illustrations and lantern slides.

One question was asked as to teaching English. In the Educational Alliance we have various classes organized solely for the purpose of rapidly teaching Jewish immigrants the English language. Those classes are very largely attended. We have now some 35 different classes taking care of the various portions of the population. The adults who work in the daytime are taught at night. The adults who work at night are taught in the daytime. The mothers have their own classes. The teachers in the Jewish religious schools have their classes in which they are taught the English language, so that they may give their instruction in religion, even, in the English language. Then there are day classes for newly arrived children; and in that way every part of the Jewish population is saturated with the English language, so that in a very short time those children, and those men and women who have come to this country after they have reached majority, are better able to speak with their Yiddish brethren in English than in Yiddish; and, as a matter of fact, it is a very curious thing that the Yiddish of New York is an entirely different language from the Yiddish of Russia, because there is an interpolation of English words from the very beginning. So that in a very short time, by a process of natural evolution, the people speak the English language and do not speak the Yiddish language.

As to the newspapers, the Yiddish newspaper performs a very important function. I had the fortune, or the misfortune, of being the organizer of a Yiddish newspaper a number of years ago, to be published purely and solely from the standpoint of civics. The papers at that time were not entirely to the satisfaction of some of the members of the community, and so we tried the experiment of establishing a paper which would do the very kind of teaching contemplated by this list of subjects which the Educational Alliance deals with. We had the Declaration of Independence translated into Yiddish. We had the Constitution of the United States translated into Yiddish. We had commentaries upon that; and we had the history of the United States from the landing of Columbus down to the present day. We had all kinds of subjects of that character, for the purpose of impressing upon the Yiddish-speaking population these ideas. To indicate the process of evolution there were two pages in English, so that they would gradually go from the Yiddish into the English. That paper resulted in a loss to the projectors of \$50,000 in two years—"and the subsequent proceedings interested them no more." [Laughter.]

But the effect of it has been that there has been a development of all the Yiddish papers in New York City in that direction; and any gentleman who is capable of reading Yiddish, as I know several members of the committee are—and I think one ought to be from his experience [laughter]—will find that all the important questions

of economics and civics, and all the important questions of politics, are most intelligently discussed in the Yiddish language in these newspapers. You need not be afraid that the Jewish people of that city, however, are going to adhere to those papers alone. They are repeatedly reading others. They are great readers of the newspapers. Anyone going into the reading room of the Educational Alliance in the evening would be astounded at the number of readers. It is astounding. And the subjects about which they read there are as numerous as the mind of man can conceive of. And, as has already been stated by Mr. Sulzberger, the public libraries in that part of the city in which the Jews live are the best patronized libraries in the city of New York. The books read are not trash and not light literature, but they deal with scientific subjects. To give an idea of the mental characteristics of the people I will say that in the Educational Alliance we had a class of 100 men who met every Saturday night, taught by Mr. Sassovitz. Some of these men were push-cart peddlers, and some of them workers at tailoring trades, but they met on Saturday night and discussed questions of science, of art, of the world's literature, and the higher mathematics. The people appreciated the subjects and took pleasure in the study of those particular matters.

I think this really is merely one of the side shows in this question, but still it indicates that the people who come here are being taken care of and are being advised; and the Educational Alliance is not the only organization that is doing it. There are the Young Men's Hebrew Association, the Young Women's Hebrew Association, and various settlements on the east side. The Wall settlement on Henry street is one of the models of the world. There is the Federation of Harlem. Those who have occasion to contribute will know how numerous they are, because their name is legion, and they are all doing this work, not only in New York, but in Chicago, in Philadelphia, in St. Louis, in San Francisco, and in every quarter of America. Lest it be thought that the Jews are all segregated and congregated in the city of New York, let me tell you that there is scarcely a community in the country in which you will not find a settlement of Jews. I think those who know them know that they are a self-respecting part of the community and are doing their part toward becoming as rapidly as possible an integral part of the American people; and they resent nothing more than to be considered as a thing apart. They want to be considered as a part of the American people.

I have read some of the debates upon this subject, and they are really amusing when we use the parallel column comparison. This same talk about inferior races has been used ever since immigration commenced.

In 1817, when the total number of immigrants to this country was 2,800, just see what Nile's Register said about the awful fate confronting the United States:

We have room enough; let them come. * * * But the emigrants should press into the interior.

The idea of having 2,800 people remaining at the seaboard:

In the present state of the times we seem too thick on the maritime frontier already. Within there is ample and profitable employment for all in almost any branch of business, and strangers should be encouraged to seek it there.

That was in 1817.

Mr. BURNETT. What was the total population of the United States then?

Mr. MARSHALL. It must have been then about 6,000,000.

Mr. ADAIR. At that time they thought the interior of the country was along about this place here, I suppose.

Mr. MARSHALL. Yes; this was rather wild. They wanted to get them away from the congested city of New York. They had a population there then, I think, of 125,000 people.

In the report of the managers of the Society for the Prevention of Pauperism in New York City, in 1819, it is said:

First, as to the emigrants from foreign countries, the managers are compelled to speak of them in the language of astonishment and apprehension. Through this inlet pauperism threatens us with the most overwhelming consequences.

See how far our country has progressed since that time, 1819:

From various causes the city of New York is doomed to be the landing place of a great portion of the European population who are daily flocking to our country for a place of permanent abode. This city is the largest importing capital of the United States, and a position from which a departure into the interior is generally considered the most easy and practicable. On being possessed of more extensive and active trade than any other commercial emporium in the Union, it naturally occurs to the minds of emigrants that we possess great means of employment. Our situation is peculiarly healthy, and no local objection, either physical or moral, exists to arrest the approach of foreigners. The present state of Europe contributes in a thousand ways to foster unceasing immigration to the United States. * * * An almost innumerable population beyond the ocean is out of employment, and this has the effect of increasing the usual want of employ. This country is the resort of vast numbers of those needy and wretched beings. Thousands are continually resting their hopes on the refuge which she offers, filled with delusive visions of plenty and luxury. They seize the earliest opportunity to cross the Atlantic and land upon our shores. * * * What has been the destination of this immense accession to our population, and where is it now? Many of these foreigners have found employment; some may have passed into the interior, but thousands still remain among us. They are frequently found destitute in our streets; they seek employment at our doors; they are found in our almshouses and in our hospitals; they are found at the bar of criminal tribunals, in our Bridewell, our penitentiary, and our state prisons. And we lament to say that they are too often led by want, by vice, and by habit to form a phalanx of plunder and depredations, rendering our city more liable to increase of crime and our houses of correction more crowded with convicts and felons.

That was in 1819. Some of those immigrants, I suppose, were your grandfathers; some of them may have been your fathers; and some arrived subsequent to that time; and still this country is what it is, and it has grown to be what it is, and these immigrants more than any other part of our population have made it what it is. They are the people who have made the great Northwest, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and the neighboring States; and they are the people who have built up the East in all our great industries. When we think of the State of New York and its large percentage of foreign population, as has been indicated here, does it not seem utterly absurd for people to say that this country is going to ruin and destruction? Ah, but some of these gentlemen say it is because the people who are coming now are of a different class. They say that the people who were here before and who were the fathers of Senators and of Members of the House of Representatives, and who are in our state legislatures, were a different class. They were Germans, and they were Irish, and they were of a better quality. But let us see what they said in 1819. They said:

The Irish had an utter distaste for felling forests and turning up the prairies for themselves. They preferred to stay where another race would furnish them with food, cloth-

ing, and labor, and hence were mostly found loitering on the lines of the public works, in villages, and in the worst portions of the large cities, where they competed with the negroes—between whom and themselves there was an inveterate dislike—for the most degrading employments.

I have other beautiful specimens of this same character, in which the German is put in the same category as the Irish. They are priest-ridden. They are people who are ignorant. They have not the ideals the Anglo-Saxon has, and words to that effect.

Later, still, we have criticisms of the Swedes and the Norwegians, and now the criticism comes of those from eastern Europe and from southern Europe.

I have had occasion to give a great deal of study to this question, with a view of seeing what the conditions are in this country to-day as the result of this eastern European and southern European migration into this country.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I think at that point I will ask you this question, so that when the Members of the House take up the hearings they may understand the official position you hold: You are now the president of the immigration commission of the State of New York?

Mr. MARSHALL. I am the ex-president. The commission was organized under an act of the legislature of the State of New York for the purpose of investigating into the condition, welfare, and industrial opportunities of aliens in the State of New York. We got through with the work and are no longer in office. I am now a private citizen. [Laughter.]

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I hope that all the extracts you have read, and those that you have not read, will go into our record.

Mr. MARSHALL. I will see that you get them.

(The extracts above referred to will be found at the end of Mr. Marshall's statement.)

Mr. BENNET. You will give a statement of the source in each instance?

Mr. MARSHALL. Yes; the authority is given in each instance.

There is now very little immigration from Ireland, England, or Germany. The need for immigration, so far as concerns the need of immigration from those countries, no longer exists; but the immigration comes from other parts of Europe. Those people come, not for the purpose of being idle, not for the purpose of making themselves public charges, but for the purpose of being useful workers in the great American beehive. We are constantly engaged in great public works. Take the State of New York, for example. At the present date the city of New York is spending over \$1,000,000 on the new waterworks system and the Ashokan dam and aqueduct. And who are doing the work there? Italians, southern Europeans and eastern Europeans. The State of New York is also spending about \$50,000,000 on the building of the new public-highway system throughout the State. Who is doing that work? The same people. No Germans, no Irish, no native-born Americans. They would not work at such jobs.

They are constructing a great barge canal, at an expense of over \$100,000,000. And who is doing the work there? Not native Americans, not the sons of Irish immigrants, or of German immigrants. The people who are doing that work are these same people from southern Europe and eastern Europe.

The railroads require trackmen. All the great public works require men to do manual labor. All that is done by the southern European and the eastern European.

Mr. BENNET. When you say all——

Mr. MARSHALL. I mean practically all.

Mr. BENNET. I assume that you mean it to apply to the mere manual labor. Many Irish and native Americans are employed as superintendents.

Mr. MARSHALL. I do not mean that the "bossing" is done by the newly arrived immigrants. That is done by those of an earlier generation; and that merely indicates the advantages of our system of government. The man who comes to-day is ready to handle the pick and shovel. As a result of his imbibing American ideas his standard of living is raised and he becomes more expert, and in five years from now he will be the boss. In ten years from now he will be the contractor. In twenty years from now he will be the alderman. [Laughter.] And so there is a development from time to time which is desirable, which is of great advantage to the country, and which adds to its strength. Every man who comes here in the vigor of manhood, and who has been admitted here, is an asset to this country of very great value. I have not any doubt but that every man who has the full possession of his faculties is worth \$2,000 net to this country the moment he arrives here; and of course it results in an increase and addition of wealth to the country. I am not discussing it as a Jewish question, but as a question which applies just as much to the Italian, the Croatian, and the Hun, as to the Jew, because they are all doing their part in the world's work and in the development of this country.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Is it your opinion, then, that our system of education here tends to make manual labor uncomfortable for the American people?

Mr. MARSHALL. Yes. I think there is a great fault in the American educational system. I may be guilty of heresy——

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. And as we educate him, and as we educate the immigrant, we wean him away from the dignity of manual labor?

Mr. MARSHALL. Precisely. I am not guilty of heresy, but people may think so. I say that one of the great difficulties that we have to contend with in the United States is an excess of education, and an erroneous theory of education, and an improper distribution of education. A man who would be a good mechanic wants to become a professional man. Nobody is satisfied with his situation—which is a very desirable condition to be in; but sometimes it has the defects of its qualities, and for that reason we sometimes find that the American-born farmer's boy leaves the farm and goes to the city and becomes a second-class clerk or a bookkeeper, or a man who erects a position which is not one-half as dignified as that of a farmer, and our farms are deserted.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Then, in your opinion, if we would have this necessary manual labor done, in digging canals, opening up roads and highways, etc., it would be well for us, perhaps, to have a few people in the country who could not read or write?

Mr. MARSHALL. I do not think it helps a man to do physical work to be able to work out a mathematical problem, or to understand astronomy, biology, or any of the other ologies, or to read or write.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. And if he did——

Mr. MARSHALL. If he did, I do not think he would stay there very long. The whole tendency of the country is upward and toward improvement. The laggards and the inferior people drop by the wayside. In sociology as in all sciences, it is a question of the survival of the fittest.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Does not that account for the continuance of the newspaper printed in the foreign language, and the concentration of people of one nationality?

Mr. MARSHALL. That is purely incidental.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. But does not that account for it?

Mr. MARSHALL. Certainly. Certain people of a colony congregate because of the fact that they like to be among people they understand and who have the same ideas and associations and the same bringing up. They naturally congregate together and have their own newspapers, just as we have the *Courier des Etats-Unis* in New York—the newspaper of the French. We have the Italian newspapers. There are probably 50 newspapers of that kind published in New York, in the Syrian, Armenian, and every known language of the world. That does not change the situation. That does not affect the Americanism of those people; because if you can speak in a dozen tongues you can preach the same doctrine and reach the people of a dozen tongues, whereas with one tongue you might be able to reach but one. The tendency is that they will all learn to speak the language of this country. The desire to get on will impel them to. There is not an Italian who does not in time begin, in his own way, to speak the English language. The children of the Italians are in a short time able to speak the English language as well as the children of any man whose ancestors came over in the *Mayflower*. The situation is no different. They will become accustomed to their environment, and they do. I am not discussing mere theories. The facts speak for themselves.

At the request of a member of the committee I have sent copies of this report [Report of Immigration Commission] to the various members of the committee, and I hope that you will all take the pains to read the chapter on “Industrial and agricultural opportunities for aliens,” running from page 130 to page 137. You will find there a discussion of this economic question as it has been taken up in New York.

We took pains to send a schedule of questions to the various manufacturers and various trades unions in all the different parts of the State of New York, as to the character of the labor they had, as to the nationality, as to the time they had been in the country, etc.; and we found—and we have here excerpts from the reports—that in many cases where there had been previously American labor, and where there had been German or Irish labor, those of other nations were coming in. But these were the reasons given by the gentlemen here:

Natives are not always available, and when available will not do the work required.

American-born citizens find more lucrative employment.

Foreigners are more reliable and do better work.

Native born are seeking other than mill work.

In the manufacture of fiber ware and material; on account of labor troubles.

Foreigners are better workers, steadier, and more sober; also not inclined to look for easy work.

One says:

Foreigners on our work have not proven satisfactory.

Another says:

Our business is too particular and fine for foreign born.

Another says:

The neatest workers are invariably American born; they are cleaner and more pride is seemingly taken by them in the execution of their work.

Then again they say they can not get the American labor. You can not get the American born to work in the mill, or to do the ordinary labor of a daily operative on public works, and therefore you must seek that labor somewhere, or else the country will be at a standstill.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. I would like to ask you in that connection, whether you are familiar with the term "a bird of passage?"

Mr. MARSHALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Do I understand it correctly when I understand that it has reference to a foreigner who comes over in a flush season, works and earns what he can, and then goes back in the dull season to spend his earnings abroad?

Mr. MARSHALL. Yes.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Will you tell us how far that practice prevails among the Jews?

Mr. MARSHALL. It can not prevail among the Jews. They have nowhere else to go.

Mr. BURNETT. They can not go back?

Mr. MARSHALL. They can not go back.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Then the tendency of the Jew is rather to remain and become naturalized, and to become Americanized.

Mr. MARSHALL. Yes, sir; as soon as possible. The moment the wished-for hour has arrived when they can become American citizens they avail themselves of that opportunity; and I can say that they are as passionately fond of this country as they detest the country from which they are refugees.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. To what extent may it be said the Jews send back to the old country the money they earn in this country, as is said to be the practice with certain other nationalities?

Mr. MARSHALL. The Jews send money to their parents, their sisters, their children, and wives, for the purpose of bringing them here as soon as they can. If, unfortunately, the parents are old, they send money to them, because the Jews are believers in the fifth commandment, and honor their parents. They observe that commandment at all times.

Mr. BURNETT. They do not send the money back to be deposited in foreign banks?

Mr. MARSHALL. They do not. They use their money in the development of American industries. There is not an industry which you can mention in which the Jews are not interesting themselves and in which they are not investing their savings—sometimes unwisely,

because sometimes they are invested as a permanent investment. [Laughter.] But in the end it makes for the well-being of this country; and if they fail in their hopes, it is only to try again after they fail the first time.

Mr. ADAIR. Have you ever traveled through the Central West, or made any observation as to the men employed in the mills and the factories and on the public works out in the Central West?

Mr. MARSHALL. I have not.

Mr. ADAIR. The statement you make regarding the employment of aliens in the factory and on the public works in the city of New York I imagine is entirely true.

Mr. MARSHALL. We have the figures to show it.

Mr. ADAIR. I do not doubt it for a moment; but when you get out in the Middle West and the extreme West you find the conditions are very different. In my country I represent a very large manufacturing district, and I do not believe that to exceed 10 per cent, or possibly not more than 5 per cent, of the men who are employed in the mills and factories in my district are other than American born. And on the public works, our road building, and so on, you seldom see an Italian employed there at all. Our Americans out there do not feel that it is a disgrace to do common labor.

Mr. MARSHALL. That is all answered by the fact that there is an ample supply of American labor for the demand which exists there, whereas in other parts of the country there is not a sufficient supply of American labor to meet the demand for labor which exists, and hence they have to get their labor where they can.

Mr. ADAIR. I think that is true.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. That is what we find in Wisconsin.

Mr. MARSHALL. Take the matter of farms. The State of New York, this report shows, is running behind in the number of farms every year. There are not less than 20,000 abandoned farms in the State of New York to-day, because there are not men there to do the work. There are abandoned farms in New England. This whole question of the high cost of living would be easily solved if you had enough farm laborers, and if the immigrants were encouraged to go upon the farms you would not have the high prices which now prevail and which cause the high cost of living.

Mr. ADAIR. There was a matter I was trying to get at this morning when I asked Mr. Sulzberger; and I will ask you whether or not your societies encourage them to take up farming in the country?

Mr. MARSHALL. They do; and I think that is one of the greatest pieces of work in that regard that has ever been undertaken.

Mr. ADAIR. The tendency, however, among the immigrants, is to remain in the cities, is it not?

Mr. MARSHALL. That is the tendency all over the world, Mr. Adair. Let me give you a few facts on that subject. The tendency of modern times has been toward the increase of the urban population at the expense of the rural districts. Let me read you a few brief statements as to the growth of cities, the figures being given for 1800, 1850, 1890, and 1900:

London: In 1800, 958,000; in 1850, 2,362,000; in 1890, 4,211,000; in 1900, 4,536,000.

New York: In 1800, 62,000; in 1850, 660,000; in 1890, 2,740,000; in 1900, 4,014,000.

Paris: In 1800, 546,000; in 1850, 1,053,000; in 1890, 2,448,000; in 1900, 2,714,000.

Berlin: In 1800, 173,000; in 1850, 378,000; in 1890, 1,578,000; in 1900, 2,033,000.

Vienna: In 1800, 232,000; in 1850, 431,000; in 1890, 1,341,000; in 1900, 1,674,000.

So I go through every large city in the world, and the fact is that, whereas at the beginning of the nineteenth century the cities were comparatively small, at the beginning of the twentieth century they had increased fivefold in population all through the world; not only in the country where the immigrant arrives, but in the country from which the immigrant comes. The tendency has been toward the building up of the city at the expense of the rural community, and the time has come when those who are wise will echo the cry "Back to the soil;" because that will be the solution of many of the great economic problems that are confronting all parts of the world.

Mr. BENNET. I might say in this connection that, as I recall the figures, in 1800 the immigrants constituted 3 per cent of the population in cities and villages of over 3,000; and it is now estimated that they constitute over 50 per cent.

Mr. BURNETT. Is it not true that the recent immigrants, at least, remain in the cities in much greater proportion than those who go into the country?

Mr. MARSHALL. I think it is true that among the more recent immigrants the smaller proportion settles on the farms, or in the country.

Mr. BURNETT. That is, during the first two years?

Mr. MARSHALL. Yes; in the beginning.

Mr. BURNETT. During the first two years.

Mr. MARSHALL. Yes; in the first place they come to New York or to Philadelphia and get employment there, but gradually they get into the country. By that I do not mean that they go on the farms, but they get into the smaller cities and then gradually into the villages and towns; and after a while when they get wise they buy farms. That fact is illustrated by the circumstance that the number of Jewish farmers is increasing every day, and the number of Italian farmers is very largely on the increase. That is also true of the Greeks, who are well known as florists, and who do a very large business in floriculture. A great many of other nationalities are carrying on truck farms near the cities. In that way there is a tendency in that direction, although it is not as rapid as it might be if they went to the country in the first place.

Mr. BENNET. The census figures show that the proportion of foreign born on the farms now is constantly increasing.

Mr. MARSHALL. It is increasing over what it has been.

Mr. BURNETT. But not in proportion to the increase of population.

Mr. BENNET. Oh, yes. The proportion of foreign born on the farms increases at a greater rate than the proportion of foreign born to our total population. The census figures show that.

Mr. BURNETT. It does not increase in proportion to the number that come in.

Mr. BENNET. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. I think you are mistaken, but I am not sure about it.

Mr. SABATH. I would like to say that a Member of the House from my State desires to be heard, and there are other gentlemen here, of course, from other States. They would like to know whether you can give them a hearing to-morrow. They will also speak against the Hayes and the Elvins bills.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I only want to say a few words.

Mr. BURNETT. I think that the gentlemen from a distance ought to have the preference. We can hear Mr. Gallagher at any time.

Mr. BENNET. If you will come to the committee room to-morrow morning between 10.30 and 12 o'clock you can be heard.

Mr. MARSHALL. This economic question——

Mr. BURNETT. Before you pass from the question of congestion I would like to ask you a question, because the other gentleman could not give me the information I wanted as to the number of foreign born in New York City. You reside, I believe, in that city?

Mr. MARSHALL. I do.

Mr. BURNETT. Can you give us that information?

Mr. MARSHALL. I can not give you the exact figures; but of course there is no doubt that it is a very large part of the population. I should think it might be safe to say that at least one-half, or possibly more, are of foreign birth in the city of New York. The proportion of foreign born in the State is at least one-third.

Mr. BURNETT. Thirty-eight per cent, I believe.

Mr. MARSHALL. I am referring to the State of New York. But when you consider in connection with that fact that the State of New York is the wealthiest State in the Union, notwithstanding that large foreign-born population; that it is advancing in every direction as rapidly as any community can advance; that it is not confined to any one line of activity, but that every branch of manufacture is conducted in that State; that every kind of employment is to be found in that State; that the foreign born is active in every one of those employments and in every direction you can look; and that you can not go down Broadway or any other street without seeing the names of foreigners prominent, as indicating that they are doing their work in the development of commerce and manufacture and every kind of activity, it is a pretty striking argument against the restriction of immigration.

Mr. ADAIR. So that immigration, you think, has been at no time inimical to the prosperity of the city of New York?

Mr. MARSHALL. Anyone who studies the history of the country, at any period, will find that if we had not been aided by this providential influx of immigration we would be very much behind the state we are now in. All this talk about immigrants is, to me, very amusing, when we consider that we are all immigrants—every one of us; I believe there is not in the House a single man with Indian blood in his veins——

Mr. BENNET. Oh, yes there is.

Mr. MARSHALL. I thought there were in the Senate, but not in the House.

Mr. BENNET. Oh, yes.

Mr. MARSHALL. Beyond that, there are very few who are in any way, in this community, descendants of the Pilgrims, or of the original settlers of the South, who arrived in the country prior to the Revolution; because I understand the Sons and Daughters of the Revolution are not very numerous—although there is one daughter of the Revolution here to-day, who is of Jewish birth. You will find that the great bulk of our population is descended from people who have been on this continent not longer than one century. Then what is the use of talking about all this difficulty with immigrants, when we are all either immigrants ourselves or the sons or grandsons of immigrants?

Mr. ADAIR. Do you believe that the increase of the head tax would lessen the number of immigrants?

Mr. MARSHALL. Certainly. If you increase the head tax to \$25 a head, it will be prohibitive in many instances. The people can not raise the money. It is a difficult thing for them to get the money with which to buy their transportation. If you add to that the artificial deterrent requiring them to pay a head tax of \$25, you make it impossible in the great majority of cases for the immigrant to come in, and most usually the people excluded are in that class of cases where the people are coming to this country as refugees from persecution—the class of people to whom our doors have been opened from the earliest day of our history.

Mr. ADAIR. There are no bills pending to increase the head tax to that amount, are there?

Mr. BENNET. Oh, yes; to \$100.

Mr. MARSHALL. The Hayes bill provides for \$25 and the Elvins bill for \$100.

Mr. ADAIR. I thought \$10 was the limit.

Mr. MARSHALL. We are still dealing in comparatively small figures, but \$25 is an amount of money which it takes years and years for people to collect when they are obliged—and it is not all a matter of the Jews, as somebody suggested to-day in reply to a question that was put—to live within the pale, to be restricted from activities, and to have their hands and feet tied as well as their consciences.

Mr. ADAIR. Let me ask you this question for information. I have heard the statement made that if the head tax were increased slightly it would not add to the expenses of the immigrant coming to this country because the steamship company would make the same price anyhow.

Mr. MARSHALL. They would not do it. How can they do it? They certainly are not going to pay the head tax if it is \$25 or \$10. Whatever they pay in some way or other is added to the immigrant's fare. They are not here as eleemosynary institutions. They are here to make money.

Mr. ADAIR. I only wanted to get your opinion in the record.

Mr. MARSHALL. Undoubtedly. Besides that, it is a very serious question whether such legislation as increasing the head tax to \$10 or \$25 would be constitutional.

Mr. BENNET. I just want to say that the statement was made to the committee that the fare had not been increased. I looked it up and found that was technically correct, and that the steamship companies' third-class rate had not been increased, but that the steamship companies had commenced, since the act of 1907, the practice of collecting the extra \$2 increase from the immigrant direct, in addition to the price he did pay.

Mr. ADAIR. I had heard the statement made, but I wanted the record to show the fact.

Mr. MARSHALL. You never can get something for nothing—not even from steamship companies.

Mr. BENNET. They say it would not be restrictive. Take an ordinary Jewish family in Russia, consisting of father, mother, and five or six children.

Mr. MARSHALL. Five persons?

Mr. BENNET. Seven persons. They would have to pay \$10 apiece.

Mr. MARSHALL. Any increase would be a burden under which they would have to stagger. If you put it at \$10 or \$25, as I say, it would be utterly prohibitive. You might as well not disguise the measure, but say, "This is a bill for the prohibition of immigration into the United States," or "For the absolute restriction of immigration."

Mr. BENNET. In other words, we might as well——

Mr. MARSHALL. Call it what it is.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. It would be building a wall around our country.

Mr. MOORE, of Texas. Do you favor any head tax at all?

Mr. MARSHALL. We do not object to a head tax. We are ready to stand on the law as it is.

Mr. MOORE, of Texas. Are you satisfied with it at present?

Mr. MARSHALL. We think it is our duty to be. We do not ask for any change in the law in that regard. Let it stand, and let us not have these constant changes.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. You prefer the enforcement of the present law as being really all that is needed?

Mr. MARSHALL. Yes. The present law is all right, if you have proper administrative regulations which will make that law effective, and which will be fair and just to all concerned, which will give a man a hearing, and give him his day in court, and which will not introduce the Russian methods into official administration.

I was just about to say on the question of the head tax that it is a very serious question of constitutional law whether any further increase of the head tax could be sustained. When the head tax was fixed at 50 cents under the act of August 3, 1882, the Supreme Court of the United States, in the "head-money case" (112 U. S., 580), had some considerable difficulty in even sustaining that, and the only way it could sustain that was by the reasoning of Mr. Justice Miller, who said it was not for the purpose of revenue, and that it was not exacted under the taxing power, but merely for the temporary care of paupers.

Mr. BURNETT. What clause of the Constitution did it come under?

Mr. MARSHALL. That it must be for some specific purpose. The taxing power can not be arbitrarily exercised. It must be for some specific governmental purpose.

Mr. BENNET. You are speaking of the case in One hundred and twelfth United States?

Mr. MARSHALL. One hundred and twelfth United States. There are other gentlemen here and I want to hurry on, unless some of you gentlemen wish to ask me questions.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. I want to ask you a question in regard to the Hayes bill. Section 7 requires that the alien shall take out a certificate of residence before he has been in the country one year.

Mr. MARSHALL. Within one year after the taking effect of the act.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Starting at line 10, it provides that "any unnaturalized alien, unless he is a teacher, student, merchant, banker, editor, professional man, or a visitor traveling for curiosity or pleasure," who does not take out a certificate shall be deported.

Mr. MARSHALL. Yes.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. What is your opinion as to that? What is the reason? What would you understand to be the reason for the exception of the banker and the editor over a poor common laborer who could not read and write?

Mr. MARSHALL. I can not conceive of any reason. I can conceive of absolutely no reason. Our laws are supposed to rest on the theory that all people are alike. The theory of our institutions is that we are not respecters of persons and that there is to be no discrimination between one class of people and another.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. In your judgment, would the banker and the editor or professional man be more desirable than the man who can not read and write?

Mr. MARSHALL. I think not. We have plenty of bankers and professional men—perhaps too many of them—but we have not enough laborers.

Mr. BURNETT. I have not conferred with Mr. Hayes and do not know his purpose, but I imagine that the certificate would be more for the purpose of identification than anything else; and the reason why he does not include the others, I suppose, is that they are not usually so migratory as the other men.

Mr. BENNET. That is taken almost bodily from the Chinese-exclusion act.

Mr. BURNETT. I suppose that is the purpose of it.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Mr. Marshall, you being a lawyer and an eminent one, as I well know, I would like to ask you this: Would it not be possible for almost any skillful alien who desired to override or to attempt to override the laws of this country to represent himself as a merchant, a banker, an editor, or a professional man?

Mr. MARSHALL. There would be no difficulty at all.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. And is not the field so wide that it would be alarmingly dangerous?

Mr. MARSHALL. Undoubtedly it would be so; but I oppose this provision on even broader and stronger grounds. These people come to this country for the purpose of aiding its development, and also of aiding themselves—for the purpose of doing their small part in the creation of a greater America. Is it not the most undignified thing in the world to say to a man who comes here with those purposes in view, "You are practically a man who is under surveillance; you must get a certificate from some official, which you must show on all occasions, to show that you have a right to be here?" Is it not an insult to the dignity of manhood? Is it not introducing Russian methods into the United States?

If you go to Russia, even a Congressman of the United States, I suppose, would have to show a passport, and would have to have it viséed and have himself entered in the police records as being a person there under surveillance.

Mr. BURNETT. And he can not get in, sometimes, even then. I have had some experience. [Laughter.] I found one place where the passport would not go, after being viséed by the Russian consul at New York.

Mr. MARSHALL. If my father and mother had been obliged, when they came to this country, to get such a certificate as that, if I should look back at their records and find such a certificate, I would feel that that was a foul blot on my escutcheon.

Mr. BENNET. A badge of degradation.

Mr. MARSHALL. A reintroduction of the yellow badge that the Jews had to wear; and I swear I would hate to see such a thing introduced

into the United States in regard to the Jew, the Italian, or any part of our community. It is the degradation of manhood, and I hope that whatever you do you will not put that blot upon people who, in time, will become citizens of the United States, and possibly members of a better strata of society than that which they are supposed to occupy when they are called upon to make that acknowledgment of humiliation.

Then, look at what would happen. You would have to get that certificate. I think Congressman Bennet has been in the United States post-office building at times when people were there who wanted to become citizens of the United States; and they have been obliged to come day after day and to stand in line from 4 o'clock in the morning until 5 o'clock in the afternoon, and then be requested to come some other day. They are compelled to leave their work before they can go through the formula of becoming American citizens; and these people who come here for the purpose of earning a livelihood might be required to stand in line day after day before they could get a certificate, and be damned up hill and down by \$2 clerks because they would feel that those people as yet had no vote, and might not, perhaps, get one. I think the administrative features of that would be abhorrent to any one's sense of right and justice, and to anyone who has seen the workings of even that part of our system which relates to the act of naturalization.

Mr. BURNETT. Would it be any more so than to require an affidavit for the purpose of naturalization?

Mr. MARSHALL. That is a matter of proof.

Mr. BURNETT. But he has to make application, and it has to be sworn to and has to be in writing. He has to make a written statement.

Mr. MARSHALL. But under our immigration law you have all the record of the man when he arrives. Why should he get a certificate of residence in addition to that after he stays his time? In regard to the act of naturalization, that is a judicial act. It is a proceeding in court. You have to have evidence, and that is perfectly proper; and the stronger your requirements may be with regard to the possession by the applicant of thorough knowledge of the genius of our institutions, of knowledge of our Government, and of ability to speak the English language, the better I like it.

Mr. BENNET. The language here is:

And any unnaturalized alien, unless he is a teacher, student, merchant, banker, editor, professional man, or a visitor traveling for curiosity or pleasure, who, after the expiration of said one year, shall be found within the United States without such certificate of residence shall be deemed to be unlawfully within the United States and shall be taken into custody upon the warrant of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, and unless it shall be satisfactorily established that the failure of such person to procure a certificate of residence as herein required during the said period of one year, as herein provided, by reason of accident, sickness, or other unavoidable cause, shall be deported, etc.

Mr. GOLDSFOGLE. It renders him practically a criminal.

Mr. MARSHALL. He is packed out of the country.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Leaving now the question of the certificate itself and taking up the other question that I asked you about a moment ago, what would be the effect of excepting teachers, students, merchants, bankers, editors, and professional men, so far as concerns the misrepresentation that might follow in the application of

those who are already prohibited by law from coming into the country.

Mr. MARSHALL. Certainly it would be a very simple thing to evade the law under such a provision.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. And what would be the effect of the exception of a teacher or a professional man?

Mr. MARSHALL. Herr Most was a teacher.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Would you expect any man so excepted to work upon the roads, or to build waterworks, or work on public works?

Mr. MARSHALL. I would not. It would be a mere matter of annoyance. That is all it amounts to. It is one more obstacle in the way.

Mr. BENNET. If it takes \$395,000 a year to enforce the Chinese exclusion act against the extremely limited number of Chinese who come, what would it cost to enforce that identical provision against these people?

Mr. MARSHALL. That is a matter of dollars and cents which I think perhaps the Members of Congress might discuss and consider; but with me it is a question of human rights and humanity, which is of much more importance, and by the side of which I think all other questions dwindle into insignificance.

Mr. BENNET. I agree with you.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. "To get down to brass tacks," as our President would say, if I were a European anarchist and I desired to come into this country, would I not, under a provision of that kind, be clever enough to come in as an editor or a professional man?

Mr. MARSHALL. Yes.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. And would I not be the very man that it is the desire of most people in this country to keep out?

Mr. BURNETT. This provision does not refer to the man who comes in, but to the man after he has been here.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. But my point is that a man having that to work on would be clever enough to use it to our great disadvantage. That is the way it occurs to me.

Mr. MARSHALL. Taking up the Elvins bill, here are the different classes to be excluded from admission into the United States:

Persons economically undesirable—

If we could review these questions in the Supreme Court of the United States as you can review almost every question, there would be a series of very interesting lawsuits which I would be very glad to argue, if I had the opportunity, without fee, to determine what the meaning of that phrase is; but inasmuch as under the law there is no way of reviewing those questions, and everything is left to bureaucrats—and I use the word without any intent to offend or to use slighting language—or to people who have arbitrary power, let us see what would happen.

"Persons economically undesirable." Undesirable to whom? How undesirable? What is meant by "undesirable?" What is meant by "economically undesirable?" Is it because they have not enough money, or is it because they have too much money? John D. Rockefeller might be economically undesirable to some people, and a man with only 50 cents in his pocket might be economically undesirable to other people, and yet they would not be, in fact, eco-

nomically undesirable to the mass of mankind. But when you draft a great statute which is to be applied to 1,000,000 people a year, to use language of that sort is to make it easy for any administrative officer to do just as he pleases. If he should say "I think this man is economically undesirable," how are you going to refute it? What are you going to do about it? You have heard a great deal about the Chancellor's foot, but there are some feet which, if applied to that language, would use it purely as a kicking-out process. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. You have no reference to Chicago, have you?

Mr. MARSHALL. No. I have no reference to any section. When I speak of a foot I merely speak of an ideal foot.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. There is a gentleman from Chicago on the committee. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARSHALL. That language is absolutely dangerous. It is potent with mischief. We have gotten along without it so well, and this country has improved so much economically, as I have tried to show, notwithstanding the absence of that language, that I do not think we ought to have a law which would make every superintendent, or whatever he is called, of a landing station, a professor of political economy, and of his own political economy. It may be free trade in one place, it may be high tariff in another, and stand-pat in still another, and you do not know where you would get in acting on these various kinds of economic ideas. As to undesirability, one man might consider that a red-headed fellow was undesirable, and another man might think that a man who had black hair would be undesirable, and some might think that a man without any hair would be undesirable. [Laughter.]

As you see, there is great vagueness, and that is a thing we ought to avoid. We have had enough vague language. Some of you gentlemen understand what has happened as the result of vague terms. When opening a Pandora's box we do not want to put additional mischief into the box so as to do harm beyond the dreams of anybody at the present time.

Mr. BURNETT. I understood you to say in response to a question a while ago that you thought the law was good as it is.

Mr. MARSHALL. I do not think it is ideal, but rather than go through this vexed question again year after year, and year after year, it is better to bear the ills we have than to fly to others that we know not of. We have this law now. All that is required, I think, in order to make it workable, is some improvement with regard to the administration of it. When proper regulations are made, so that people will have a chance to be heard, I think the law will work out all right; but I think we ought not to make any one of these changes under consideration.

Here is the next thing:

Male persons over sixteen years of age who do not possess in their own right at least one hundred dollars in lawful money of the United States or other money of equal value.

One hundred dollars. Think of a man from Russia, from Roumania, fleeing for his life, the victim of a "pogrom," or the members of a family fleeing as the result of an insurrection or a mob's wild action, having \$100 in their possession.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. That is 200 roubles in Russia, and a man who had it would be considered quite wealthy.

Mr. MARSHALL. Perhaps the argument I am now making would be considered by you as a good argument against my position, but I would not be here if anything like that had been in force when my father came to this country.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I would not be here, either.

Mr. MARSHALL. My father had exactly 95 cents in his pocket when he landed in the city of New York on the 1st of September, 1849.

Mr. BENNET. I do not suppose my French refugee ancestor had anything.

Mr. MARSHALL. Then my father was a little better off than he was.

Mr. BENNET. Yes.

Mr. MOORE, of Texas. Perhaps the cost of living was not so high then.

Mr. MARSHALL. My father has told me that he spent that 95 cents on peaches. He had been on a sailing vessel about sixty-three days, and he thought he would have something fresh to eat; so that when the day was over, he had not a red cent. He did not remain in New York. He went to work on the Erie Railroad, and then he helped to build the Northern Central.

It seems to me inconceivable, when people are coming here, ready to be deposited right at our door, full of hope and ambition, that we should say to them: "We will not let you come in unless you have \$100, or \$25." It is utterly contrary to the spirit of our institutions. I wonder what George Washington or Thomas Jefferson would have said if anybody had thought of such legislation in their day. I know what they would have said, because I have extracts from some of their writings in which both Washington and Jefferson speak of the great desirability of having immigration. And Rush, in his diary, when minister to England, said that the desire of foreigners to emigrate to the United States was a very desirable thing, and that men are the best of all imports.

I think it is a great deal better to have the man than to have the \$100. This reminds me of the story told by Benjamin Franklin, which you all know, in connection with a property qualification for a voter, where it was desired that a man who had property worth \$50 should be a voter. He said, "Suppose a man has a mule worth \$50. Can he vote?" "Yes." "Suppose the mule dies. What then?" "Then he can not vote." "Well, does the franchise reside in the mule or in the man?" [Laughter.]

Now, here is the next thing:

Persons between the ages of sixteen and fifty years who can not pass the physical examination prescribed for recruits by the military regulations of the United States Army.

I know that I could not pass that examination. I am nearsighted. There may be members of the committee who are nearsighted, or who may have other ailments, or who in other respects, perhaps, may not come up to the qualifications. It may be a matter of eyesight or a matter of weight, but all this is unnecessary. We have not had any trouble——

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. That squints very much toward compulsory military service?

Mr. MARSHALL. Compulsory military service does not stand in the way of our immigrants. Our immigrants were in the Army of the United States and in the confederate army during the civil war, and they were pretty good soldiers at that. There were Germans who came to this country as fugitives from their Government, and they helped to fight the battles of the Republic. There have always been a large number of immigrants in our army, and are now, and Mr. Wolf, here, has written a book for the purpose of showing how many Jews there were in the army in the civil war. At a time when there were probably not more than one hundred to one hundred and fifty thousand in the United States there were 8,000 at least on the rosters of the army, and most of those people were recent immigrants. They had not been here many generations. They fought for their country. Nobody tried to avoid military duty. On the east side, in the Educational Alliance—and I come to that once more—we had young men clamoring for the privilege of enlisting during the Spanish-American war.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. In fact, they were among the very first who wanted to enlist.

Mr. MARSHALL. I remember that it is one of the traditions of Syracuse, where I was born, that in the early part of 1862 there was enlisted a company from one Jewish congregation, Company A, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment, every man of whom was a Jew, and every one of whom came from abroad, foreign born, and some of whom had not even had time to become citizens.

Mr. BURNETT. I want to supplement that by a statement that in the South during the civil war a brave old Jewish friend of mine, Major Herzberg, of Gadsden, Ala., a major in the Confederate army, was shot down and carried from the field of battle, thought to be in a dying condition. He lived for nearly forty years afterwards, and a few years ago died as the result of those wounds.

Mr. MARSHALL. Yes. Mr. Wolf shows that there were 8,000, and he has by no means exhausted the list.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know whether you intend to give ample time for gentlemen here from New York and Providence to be heard. I suppose you intend to adjourn soon.

Mr. MARSHALL. I shall stop in two minutes. I think your suggestion is a wise one.

Mr. BENNET. I think the committee is very much interested. There is no idea of adjourning.

Mr. MARSHALL. The next thing is the illiteracy test:

Persons over sixteen years of age, physically capable of reading and writing, who can not read and write English or the language of some other European country or Hebrew or Yiddish.

I think I have discussed the question of the illiteracy test sufficiently. A man's ability to work is not dependent upon the amount of learning he has. A man who has a willing mind and a strong body and a desire to work and to earn his livelihood is a man who is desirable; and as has been suggested by Congressman Moore, the students, and the men of that type, the editors, etc., are not always the best citizens we can get. Some of them are anarchists. Many of them have been leaders of the anarchistic movement, and have done a great deal toward disseminating the seed of discontent. The man

who works hard eight or ten hours a day has not much time for disseminating the seed of discontent. He does his work and gives value for what he receives. What more do you want? He will be educated. He has the opportunity of being educated after he is here; but so far as his usefulness is concerned, that is not dependent upon his ability to read or write. I have known men who starved in seven languages, and who were unable to earn their living. I had one write me a letter last night, a man who is a physician, a man of education, who does not know where to go for money to pay his rent. The industrious immigrant is able to fight his way, and he is not dependent upon the United Charities, and the statistics show here that we are not troubled by the recent immigration with respect to the question of pauperism. The almshouses of the State of New York have a very small percentage of recent immigrants. There are many more people in the almshouse of native-born origin than those of recent immigration. The smallest percentage, according to the statistics of the New York State immigration report is composed of eastern and southern Europeans, so far as the almshouses are concerned; and as to the relationship of illiteracy and criminality, that subject has been fully discussed and established to the advantage of the immigrant by the argument made by Mr. Sulzberger.

Now comes another provision:

Persons over sixteen years of age who do not bring a certificate of good moral character signed by and under the seal of the proper official or officials whose duty it is to keep such record in the community from which they come, which certificate shall state that such person has not been convicted of or indicted for having committed any crime involving moral turpitude or been an inmate of any almshouse, insane asylum, or prison.

In other words, this requires that a man who comes to this country from Russia, or Roumania, for example, must bring with him a certificate of good moral character. Who gives him that certificate of good moral character? The police authorities, the public authorities. Gentlemen, do you think that people who are engaged in murdering the men of a certain race or of a certain class, and of stealing their property, are going to give certificates of good character to them? Do you think that that is such an easy thing to procure? Why, one of the noblest men of our time, Nicholas Tschaikovsky, could not get a certificate of good character from Russia; and Madame Breshovsky, one of the noblest women in all the history of the world, has been condemned to exile in Russia. She could not get a certificate of good character from that Government. Yet here we are trying to put upon the statute books of the United States a provision to the effect that before a person can be permitted to come here he must get a certificate of good character from such a government as that, or such a government as Roumania, which treats the Jews as aliens, although under the terms of the treaty of Berlin they were bound to be treated as citizens.

That applies to all classes. It is only another way of indirectly saying that we will stop immigration. If you are going to do it, if the Congress of the United States has made up its mind that it can afford to do it, do it openly and aboveboard, and say, "There shall be no more immigration;" but do not do it by indirection, by saying that a man must have \$100 when he can not get it; by saying that he

must be "economically desirable," when you do not know what that is; that he must be able to stand the test of physical examination prescribed for recruits by the military regulations of the United States Army; that he must be able to read and write English or some other European language; and that he must bring a certificate of good character.

Let us suppose the case of a poor fellow who has just been driven out of his house and home in Odessa, or in any of these other places where "pogroms" are always being committed upon them. He says "I have got to go to America. Now, what have I got to do in order to go to America?" He looks at the Elvins and Hayes bills; and I think he will blow out his brains. There would not be anything else for him to do, because he could not come here and he could not stay there. He is driven from pillar to post. He does not know what is required of him. He may be a man who is 5 feet 2 inches in height, and not knowing anything about the military regulations of the United States Army he may suppose that he would be required to pass the examination prescribed for the grenadiers of Frederick.

Other gentlemen here will discuss the question from other stand-points; but I have too much confidence in the good sense of the American people to believe that that kind of legislation is going to be put upon our statute books.

The extracts referred to by Mr. Marshall are as follows:

EXTRACT FROM NILE'S REGISTER, VII, 1817.

[P. 359.]

We have room enough; let them come. * * * But the emigrants should press into the interior. In the present state of the times we seem too thick on the maritime frontier already. Within there is ample and profitable employment for all, in almost any branch of business, and strangers should be encouraged to seek it there.—Industrial Commission Report, Volume XV, page 449.

EXTRACT FROM THE SECOND ANNUAL REPORT OF THE MANAGERS OF THE SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF PAUPERISM IN NEW YORK CITY, 1819.

[Industrial Commission Report, p. 449.]

First, as to the emigrants from foreign countries, the managers are compelled to speak of them in the language of astonishment and apprehension. Through this inlet pauperism threatens us with the most overwhelming consequences. From various causes the city of New York is doomed to be the landing place of a great portion of the European population who are daily flocking to our country for a place of permanent abode. This city is the largest importing capital of the United States, and a position from which a departure into the interior is generally considered the most easy and practicable. On being possessed of more extensive and active trade than any other commercial emporium in the Union, it naturally occurs to the minds of emigrants that we possess great means of employment. Our situation is peculiarly healthy and no local objection, either physical or moral, exists to arrest the approach of foreigners. The present state of Europe contributes in a thousand ways to foster unceasing immigration to the United States. * * * An almost innumerable population beyond the ocean is out of employment and this has the effect of increasing the usual want of employ. This country is the resort of vast numbers of those needy and wretched beings. Thousands are continually resting their hopes on the refuge which she offers, filled with delusive visions of plenty and luxury. They seize the earliest opportunity to cross the Atlantic and land upon our shores. * * * What has been the destination of this immense accession to our population, and where is

it now? Many of these foreigners have found employment; some may have passed into the interior; but thousands still remain among us. They are frequently found destitute in our streets; they seek employment at our doors; they are found in our almshouses and in our hospitals; they are found at the bar of criminal tribunals, in our Bridewell, our penitentiary, and our state prison. And we lament to say that they are too often led by want, by vice, and by habit to form a phalanx of plunder and depredations, rendering our city more liable to increase of crime and our houses of correction more crowded with convicts and felons.

EXTRACT FROM THE REPORT OF THE INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION, 1819.

[Vol. XV, p. 462.]

It had early occurred to those interested in bettering city conditions that one means of relief would be to assist migration to the interior, to country districts.

This means, indeed, was suggested at the very time the immigration problem itself was formulated in the report of the Society for the Prevention of Pauperism for 1819, already quoted from. The managers say:

"It would prove a great relief could means of employment be found (for the immigrants) when they enter our city. Many thousands who arrive in this country from Europe have been servants or manufacturers, and do not understand the art of husbandry; yet many arrive in destitute condition who have worked on the soil. A great many others are vigorous, healthy, and capable of learning the art of agriculture. Could some communication be opened with our great farmers and landholders in the interior, and ways and means be provided for the transportation of able-bodied foreigners into the interior and labor be provided for them, it appears to the managers that beneficial consequences might flow from the expedient. Many, very many, foreigners who are honest and industrious and who, for want of employment, are liable to become paupers, would gladly depart into the country and labor upon the soil or in workshops could they thus obtain a bare living. In this case our city would be somewhat relieved, the number on our criminal calendar diminished, and the emigrant now on the brink of pauperism, or begging alms and receiving charitable aid, become useful to himself and to the community. Instead of bringing up his children in idleness, temptation, and crime he would see them amalgamated with the general mass of our population, deriving benefits from our school systems, our moral institutions, and our habits of industry."^a

"They (the Irish) had an utter distaste for felling forests and turning up the prairies for themselves. They preferred to stay where another race would furnish them with food, clothing, and labor, and hence were mostly found loitering on the lines of the public works in villages and in the worst portions of the large cities, where they competed with the negroes, between whom and themselves there was an inveterate dislike, for the most degrading employments."^b

EXTRACT FROM A PAPER ENTITLED "IMMINENT DANGERS TO THE INSTITUTIONS OF THE UNITED STATES THROUGH FOREIGN IMMIGRATION, ETC.," BY "AN AMERICAN"—S. F. B. MORSE, 1835.

"(In speaking of the immigration of previous years as compared with that of the day:) Then, we were few, feeble, and scattered. Now, we are numerous, strong, and concentrated. Then our accessions of immigration were real accessions of strength from the ranks of the learned and the good, from enlightened mechanic and artisan and intelligent husbandman. Now, immigration is the accession of weakness, from the ignorant and vicious, or the priest-ridden slaves of Ireland and Germany, or the out-cast tenants of the poorhouses and prisons of Europe.

^a Second annual report of managers of Society for Prevention of Pauperism in New York City, 1819.

^b Association for Improvement of Condition of the Poor, 1860, page 50.

EXTRACT FROM AN OPEN LETTER TO AARON CLARK, MAYOR OF NEW YORK CITY,
SIGNED "A NATIVE." 1837.

When foreigners come to us in large bodies, they are desirous of living together, and by that course they preserve the whole current of their prejudices and national peculiarities and never become transformed to our habits of thinking and acting. * * *

Not one-half of their sufferings are made public. Living in small apartments, destitute of pure air, cleanliness, and wholesome food, they die in multitudes in every part of the country. * * *

Our lands, under the culture of foreigners, will yield but little more than half as much as under our own husbandry.

EXTRACT FROM A MEMORIAL TO THE MAYOR AND BOARD OF ALDERMEN OF THE
CITY OF NEW YORK, BY THE GENERAL COMMITTEE OF NATIVE AMERICANS, JUNE,
1837.

* * * During the last seven years 296,259 foreigners arrived at this port (New York) alone—equal in amount to the present population of the whole city. Sixty thousand five hundred and fifty-one arrived in the year 1836—double the amount that came in 1830. Four thousand nine hundred and twenty-eight arrived here between the 9th and 13th of the present month—June, 1837.

On the 1st of January, 1837, 982 foreigners and 227 native American citizens had been admitted to the hospital at Bellevue. The preceding year, on the 1st day of May last, there were in the almshouse 1,437 paupers. Allowing the same proportion of foreigners as in the hospital there would be 1,068 foreigners and 369 native American citizens in the almshouse.

It appears from the report of a commission monthly appointed by the board of aldermen of this city that there are at the date of this report 3,070 paupers in the almshouse, more than three-fourths of whom are foreigners. How many more of this class live upon private charities? Let the swarm of mendicants who daily and nightly infest our streets attest.

* * * At a recent date it appears that the number of convicts confined in Sing Sing were 800, of whom 603 were foreigners. * * *

In the year ending in August, 1836, there were received in the Boston house of refuge 866 paupers, 516 of whom were foreigners. From the 1st of January to April 25, 1837, there were 264 paupers admitted to the same house of refuge, 160 of whom were aliens.

EXTRACTS FROM THE "ADDRESS OF THE DELEGATES OF THE NATIVE AMERICAN
NATIONAL CONVENTION," PHILADELPHIA, JULY 4, 1845.†

It is an incontrovertible truth that the civil institutions of the United States of America have been seriously affected and that they now stand in imminent peril from the rapid and enormous increase in the body of residents of foreign birth, imbued with foreign feelings and of an ignorant and immoral character. * * *

But for the last twenty years the road to civil preferment and participation in the legislative and executive government of the land has been laid broadly open, alike to the ignorant, the vicious, and the criminal; and a large proportion of the foreign body of citizens and voters now constitute a representation of the worst and most degraded of the European population—victims of social oppression or personal vices, utterly divested by ignorance or crime of the moral and intellectual requisites of political self-government.

The almshouses of Europe are emptied upon our coast, and this by our own invitation—not casually, or to a trivial extent—but systematically and upon a constantly increasing scale. * * * The United States are rapidly becoming the lazar house and penal colony of Europe. * * *

EXTRACT FROM THE RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE CONVENTION, JULY 5 AND 7, 1845.

* * * Believing that ruin, if it come, will come through a perversion and abuse of that right (suffrage);

Believing that such perversion and abuse to have already prevailed and to be now increasing to an alarming extent;

Believing that the greatest source of evil in this respect is to be found in the rapid influx of ignorant foreigners, and the facility with which they are converted into citizens. * * *

EXTRACT FROM THE REPORT OF THE INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION.

[Vol. XV, p. 460.]

"The almshouse returns show that about 86 per cent of the persons relieved by charitable aid are of foreign birth, of which 69 per cent were Irish and about 10 per cent German, or nearly 7 Irish to 1 German. As the Irish population, however, is nearly twice that of the German, the actual ratio is about 3½ Irish to 1 German, and 5 Irish to 1 American."^a

In chronic pauperism, as contrasted with that temporary condition of want requiring relief into which any immigrant might fall while going through the process of industrial adjustment, the Irish were far in the lead. A confidential list published by one charitable society, of cases on their hands for three years and over, and giving names and addresses, showed that the great bulk of such cases were Irish. On this list, comprising 650 names, there were only 4 which could be recognized as distinctly German; of the rest, all might, and a great majority must, have belonged to persons of Irish birth or descent.

EXTRACT FROM THE REPORT OF THE INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION.

[Vol. XV, p. 464.]

The crude impression, then, that the less crowded a country the easier and more rapid is the dispersion of population, would seem to be quite the reverse of the truth. There was apparently a greater tendency for immigrants to remain in seaboard cities in 1817, when the interior was an untrodden wilderness, than in 1860. The fact seems to be (within limits and subject to modifications) that as the population increases and becomes more highly organized adjustment to the social framework and dispersion from cities become easier of accomplishment. Thus, in the first half of the nineteenth century the opening of the wilderness, the growth of manufacturing industries in interior towns and cities, the development of transportation and ways of communication by mail and telegraph, were all means of facilitating the passage of the emigrant from the place where his presence was not desired and his labor not especially needed to places where his presence as particularly objected to and his labor was greatly needed.

EXTRACT FROM THE REPORT OF THE INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION.

[Vol. XV, p. 455.]

"So large are the aggregations of different foreign nationalities," the report goes on to say, "that they no longer conform to our habits, opinions, and manners; on the contrary, create for themselves distinct communities, almost as impervious to American sentiments and influences as are the inhabitants of Dublin or Hamburg. * * * They have their own theaters, recreations, amusements, military and national organizations; to a great extent their own schools, churches, and trade unions; their own newspapers, and periodical literature."^b

* * * The inhabitants of the district were largely of foreign birth; about one-half the population were Irish, about one-fourth Germans, the remainder were Americans, Swedes and Danes. About two-thirds of the population were laborers and mechanics with their families; the remainder were retail shopkeepers and keepers of hotels and sailors' and immigrants' boarding houses. A large element of the population was a floating one, consisting of travelers, immigrants, sailors, and "vagabonds without a habitation and almost without a name."^c

CHURCH AND STATE IN THE UNITED STATES.

[By J. P. Thomson, Boston, Osgood, 1873.]

A very large percentage of vice and crime in the United States, especially in the great cities, is chargeable to European immigration. The police statistics of New York show that the vast majority of prisoners arrested for criminal offenses are of European birth, and of these, again, the great majority are natives of Ireland.

^a Report of Association for Improvement of Condition of the Poor, 1860, p. 49.

^b Report of the Association for Improvement of the Poor, 1867, p. 42.

^c Report Council of Hygiene, p. 5.

Thus, reared under the European systems of state religion, prisoners, baptized, taught and confirmed in state churches or, as in Ireland, reared under the imperious ecclesiastical authority of Rome, become outlaws of American society. America owes to Europe those two deadly foes of evangelical religion, Romanism and Rationalism; while Mormonism is recruited almost entirely from Northern Europe.

Hence the feeling is quite prevalent in the United States that a system of state religion tends toward practical heathenism and unbelief; that its training tends to substitute forms and dogmas for a personal religious faith, and its restraints and compulsions tend to produce a reaction against all belief; while the free religious system of the United States develops in church members the sense of personal responsibility and the spirit of religious activity; and the exhibition of these commands the respect of the community for religion and infuses into society a healthy moral sentiment, which in turn sustains the state in enforcing essential morality by the authority of law.

NOTE.—Of 80,532 prisoners arrested by the police of New York in 1867, only 27,156 were of American birth; and of the 53,376 foreigners who disturbed the peace of the city, 38,128 were Irish. From 1860 to 1868 there were within the precincts of the New York metropolitan police, 706,288 arrests. Of these there were 204,129 Americans, the foreigners numbering 502,159, of which 373,341 were Irish. This preponderance of foreign-born criminals is peculiar to New York, where naturally the worst elements of immigration would remain. The same ratio appears in the country at large

The following facts are authentic. In prison in the United States on June 1, 1871, there were 32,901 prisoners thus distributed:

Native whites.....	16, 117
Colored people.....	8, 056
Foreign born.....	8, 728
Total prisoners.....	32, 901
Native white population.....	28, 111, 133
Colored population.....	4, 880, 009
Foreign-born population.....	5, 567, 229
Total population.....	38, 588, 371

showing that (assuming all in prison to be criminals) there is at least one criminal in every 1,172 of the population, one in every 1,744 of our native white population, one in every 637 of our foreign-born population, and one in every 605 of our colored population.

When European journals picture crime as abounding in the United States, they should have the candor to add that, though foreigners compose only one-sixth of the total white population, they furnish one-third of the white criminals, and, in the ratio of criminals, are on a level with the ignorant and degraded negroes.

Their crimes are not a fruit of American society.

Growth of cities (population in thousands).

[Encyclopedia of Social Reform, New York, 1908, p. 234.]

City.	1800.	1850.	1890.	1900.
London.....	958	2, 362	4, 211	4, 536
New York.....	62	660	2, 740	4, 014
Paris.....	546	1, 053	2, 448	2, 714
Berlin.....	173	378	1, 578	2, 033
Tokyo.....				1, 818
Vienna.....	232	431	1, 341	1, 674
Chicago.....		30	1, 099	1, 698
Philadelphia.....	81	408	1, 047	1, 293
St. Petersburg.....	270	490	1, 003	1, 373
Constantinople.....	300	400	873	1, 125
Moscow.....	300	360	822	1, 092
Bombay.....	150	560	821	1, 125
Rio de Janeiro.....	125	170	800	872
Calcutta.....	800	400	741	776
Hamburg ^a	120	205	711	750
Manchester ^b	90	308	703	543
Buenos Aires.....	70	120	677	1, 000
Glasgow.....	77	329	658	735
Liverpool.....	82	376	518	684

^a Including Altoona.

^b Including Salford.

Population in cities of 100,000 or over.

[Encyclopedia of Social Reform, New York, 1908, p. 235.]

Country.	1800 ^a total population in such cities.	Per cent. of popu- lation.	1850 ^a total.	Per cent.	1900 ^a total.	Per cent.
United States.....			1,393,338	6.0	14,208,347	18.6
Canada.....					397,870	7.4
Great Britain and Ireland.....	1,032,745	^b 9.7	4,791,886	^b 22.5	13,193,487	30.5
France.....	767,386	2.8	1,656,900	4.6	4,876,869	12.2
Prussia, Saxony, and Bavaria.....	186,380	^b 1.8	617,000	^c 3.1	^d 9,108,814	^d 16.1
Holland and Belgium.....	217,622	^e 11.5	518,587	^e 7.3	2,337,714	19.4
Spain.....	167,607	1.4	683,921	4.4	1,606,699	8.7
Portugal.....	350,000	9.5	275,826	7.2	447,417	8.9
Italy.....	890,000	4.4	1,425,000	6.0	3,318,939	10.0
Austria.....	282,000	2.6	484,942	2.8	2,452,351	9.3
Hungary.....			156,506	1.3	505,763	2.6
Greece.....					111,485	4.5
Norway, Sweden, and Denmark....	100,975	(^f)	123,123	(^f)	876,069	8.8
Russia.....	595,000	1.4	1,123,698	1.6	5,723,918	5.3
	4,448,000	13,249,987	58,567,788

^a Approximate date. ^b England and Wales. ^c Prussia. ^d Germany. ^e Holland. ^f Sweden.

Population of cities of 20,000 or over.

[Encyclopedia of Social Reform, New York, 1908, p. 235.]

Country.	1800, ^a total population in such cities.	Per cent of popu- lation.	1850, ^a total.	Per cent.	1900, ^a total.	Per cent.
United States.....	201,416	3.8	2,271,680	9.8	20,795,716	25.2
Canada.....			175,287	7.4	689,448	11.9
Great Britain and Ireland.....	2,283,868	^b 16.9	7,640,912	^b 35.0	21,000,000	48.3
France.....	1,840,386	6.7	3,811,500	10.6	8,668,036	22.2
Prussia, Saxony, and Bavaria.....	845,500	^b 6.0	2,784,000	^c 7.8	^d 14,300,000	25.4
Holland and Belgium.....	721,342	^e 24.5	1,382,703	^e 21.7	3,587,525	28.9
Spain.....	1,112,877	9.7	1,489,688	9.6	3,600,000	19.3
Portugal.....	380,000	10.3	415,286	10.7	470,606	8.7
Italy.....	1,000,000	2,500,000	5,000,000	15.1
Austria.....	449,000	3.5	720,000	4.2	4,044,000	14.1
Hungary.....	228,000	2.3	526,602	4.5	1,709,698	8.5
Greece.....	31,125	212,762	8.8
Norway, Sweden, and Denmark....	173,627	^f 3.0	297,795	^f 3.4	1,233,326	12.2
Russia.....	1,088,000	2.4	2,530,954	3.5	10,792,247	8.4
	10,355,141	26,546,955	96,103,364

^a Approximate date. ^c Prussia. ^e Holland.
^b England and Wales. ^d Germany. ^f Sweden.

Some comparative statistics.

[Encyclopedia of Social Reform, New York, 1908, p. 234.]

City.	Popula- tion.	Area.	Density per acre.	Death rate.
		<i>Acres.</i>		
London.....	4,654,437	75,575	61	16.6
New York.....	4,014,000	197,760	20	18.2
Paris.....	2,714,000	19,259	142	17.2
Berlin.....	2,033,000	15,676	130	16.9
Vienna.....	1,674,000	43,980	38	18.3
Chicago.....	2,050,000	121,920	17	16.2
Philadelphia.....	1,500,506	82,880	18	21.2
St. Petersburg (with suburbs).....	1,487,000	71,679	20	23.7
Hamburg.....	872,000	94,693	9	17.9
Manchester.....	631,185	19,893	31	21.3
Glasgow.....	798,778	12,796	63	21.2
Liverpool.....	710,337	17,792	40	22.6

Some comparative statistics—Continued.

	Year.	Popula- tion per square mile.	Population of United States if as thickly populated (approx- imately).
United Kingdom.....	1906	359. 65	1, 600, 000, 000
Germany.....	1905	290. 40	870, 000, 000
France.....	1905	189. 80	570, 000, 000
Italy.....	1904	303. 70	900, 000, 000
Belgium.....	1905	629. 60	1, 770, 000, 000
Austria.....	1905	235. 03	680, 000, 000
Hungary.....	1905	160. 36	460, 000, 000

NOTE.—While there is no telling how large a population this country could actually support, there is no doubt that there is ample room in this country at this time, without overcrowding, for from two hundred and fifty to five hundred millions.

Mr. SABATH. If you will permit me, I desire to say that there are present a number of gentlemen representing numerous Slavonic and Slavic organizations. They have been here since yesterday, and most of them are obliged to leave because of arrangements which they have made before leaving their respective homes. I have promised to secure for them a portion of the time of the committee so that they could be heard, and present their views on these bills, and I most respectfully insist that they be heard.

Mr. Svarc, I believe, is obliged to leave this evening, and I think he would like to address the committee briefly. He represents some of the Slavonic and Slavic organizations and societies.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I think he should be heard now.

Mr. SABATH. Therefore I ask that Mr. Svarc be given an opportunity now to address the committee.

Mr. BENNET. We will be glad to hear Mr. Svarc.

STATEMENT OF MR. VEN SVARC, OF CLEVELAND, OHIO.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Svarc, what association or society do you represent?

Mr. SVARC. I have the honor to speak to you in behalf of the National Slavonic Society of the United States, numbering about 40,000 members. They are scattered all over the length and breadth of the land; and also in Canada, where there is the largest Slavonic organization in the world.

I do not believe, speaking generally upon the immigration problem, I can add very much to the able and cogent arguments which have been advanced by those who have preceded me to-day, whom I have had the honor to listen to. I shall speak but briefly about the Slavonic immigrants who come from Austro-Hungary, particularly. There seems to be a widespread delusion about the undesirability of the later comers from Europe, and we are at a loss to understand just what is meant by the immigrants from southern and eastern Europe.

The Slavonic immigrant—and by that term I would include the members of the various Slavonic nations which go to make up the Slavic race—is not really a newcomer to America; and it is related

in history that if George Washington had married Miss Phillips, of Yonkers, N. Y., he would have married the descendant of a Bohemian family, and consequently the Slavs to-day would be in very close relationship with the father of his country; for the Phillipses were Bohemian immigrants who came to this country in the seventeenth century. In those early times the exiles who were scattered throughout the world after the thirty years' war numbered a great many Bohemian immigrants who came to the shores of America; and as I am aware of the fact that one of the members of your committee comes from the State of Alabama, I believe if you will refer to De Schweinitz's History of the Unitas Fratrum, or Moravian United Brethren, you will find that those Bohemian exiles of those days contributed their part to the development of the South, as well as to the development of the State of Alabama; for one of the exiles was one of the first pastors in the city of Savannah, Ga. They sent their missionaries through the South. They sent them through the civilized world, and one of the members of that same church, the Moravian church, was one of the greatest Indian missionaries the world ever knew. They also furnished a missionary to Greenland, who left the impress of his work there, and who died in the south of the United States.

Mr. BURNETT. The very first female college there ever was in the South was founded by a Moravian missionary association.

Mr. SVARC. So that we who are of Bohemian blood, and I am proud to say that I am a descendant of a Bohemian family—my parents were immigrants—feel that we have done something in the development of this great land of ours. The Bohemians were probably the first Slavic people to emigrate—that is, in large numbers. They started to emigrate to the United States after the great revolution that swept Europe in 1848, and by 1880 the great bulk of the Bohemian immigrants had already come to the United States. After them began to flock the other various Slavonic nations. The Poles followed the Bohemians, and then came the Slovaks from upper Hungary, and later on have been coming the Slavenes of western Austria.

Still later came the Croatians, the Servians, and the Bulgarians, of southern Europe. So that the Slavic immigration to-day forms one of the great problems and constitutes, next to the Italians, I believe, the largest individual force of immigrants that is coming over.

I have been very much interested in the remarks of Mr. Marshall here pertaining to the tests that have been laid down in this bill which has been discussed, viz, the illiteracy test and the test of the amount of money that an immigrant is to bring over with him. I assure you, gentlemen, that if some of these tests, particularly the money test, had been in effect heretofore, the Slavic immigration to this country would to-day be a very negligible quantity.

It seems to me that when a bill is introduced in the Congress of the United States which contains the elements of the Elvins bill, we are certainly departing very widely from the traditions of the fathers who established this Republic—the traditions that ought to be part and parcel of every American heart and every American mind. For there is not an element of our population—I do not care what it is—that did not come over because their ancestors were compelled to leave the home country by stress of political or religious

persecution in some manner or other. After all, the great bulk of the American population are the children of refugees. We are the children of exiles in every stage of American history. And when you put down the qualification of literacy, or when you put down the qualification of the amount of money that an immigrant must have, even though you may be doing it in the belief that you are endeavoring to assist in building up the future of this country of ours, you are making a sad mistake. For if you stop to think you must come to the conclusion that a man is often not illiterate because of his choice; a man is often not illiterate because of his own indolence, but the economical, industrial, and political situation and environments which surround him have made him so.

Take the Slovak of upper Hungary, who is being ground between the upper and the nether millstones of political oppression, who is being persecuted because he dares to speak his mother tongue, because the Magyar would make the country homogeneous and deprive him of the language of his fathers. He has not even an opportunity to go to school. Imagine the situation that exists with the child of a nation that is not allowed to teach its own mother tongue at home, when that child has not the opportunity to learn that tongue, and with the greatest difficulty must learn a tongue which is foreign to him in every respect. Imagine how much that sort of a person has the opportunity to acquire a literary knowledge, however elementary it may be.

Mr. BURNETT. May I interrupt you right there? And yet, under all those conditions, less than 1 per cent of the Bohemians over 14 years of age that come to this country are illiterate—one in a hundred.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; that applies to the Bohemians.

Mr. BURNETT. Why is it that their neighbors, under the same conditions, could not acquire at least a rudimentary education?

Mr. SVARC. It is for this reason: In Bohemia they have autonomy; they have the management of their own schools. The Bohemians have been leaders in education. The Bohemian nation furnished the world one of its greatest educational reformers, a teacher who to-day is a model in education—John Amos Comenius. They have been noted for that. Having control of their own schools, they can educate their children. But the Slovaks of upper Hungary are enthralled. They have a hostile government which is trying to denationalize them; a government which has taken away from them all the elementary schools as well as the higher schools. They have absolutely nothing to say in governmental matters. They can not even protest; they dare not protest, for when they do they are cast into prison. They absolutely can not control the situation as far as education is concerned.

Mr. BURNETT. Then the same condition does not apply to them that applies to the Bohemians?

Mr. SVARC. No.

Mr. BURNETT. I asked that for information.

Mr. SVARC. That, gentlemen, is also true of every nation in that part of Austria-Hungary which is ruled from Budapest. They are seeking now to denationalize the Croats. They are seeking to denationalize the Roumanians in the East. In fact, the great denationalizing policy is rampant there at the present time, and has been ever since 1868, when the Magyars received the power by dividing

the Empire into two sections, and began ruling the part across the river Leitha from Budapest. Since 1868 these peoples have been deprived of the opportunity to learn their mother tongue. You can imagine that when a sudden crisis arises where they can not learn their mother tongue, and a totally foreign language is impressed upon them, it takes some time before the situation is cleared up so that they have an opportunity to gain an elementary education. I was wondering, gentlemen, when I read in the bill the provision that the immigrant must have a knowledge of the language of some European country what test would be put to the immigrant as to what country's language he knew.

Mr. BURNETT. It may be any under the educational test.

Mr. SVARC. Yes; but it says "the language of a European country."

Mr. BURNETT. Does it not even say "or a dialect?"

Mr. SVARC. It is not clear in that respect. That is the point I make. Suppose the Slovak came here knowing the Magyar tongue, which is forced upon him, and not being able to write in his own tongue, never having had that opportunity, he would, ipso facto, be excluded.

Mr. BENNET. It says, "English, or the language of some other European country."

Mr. SVARC. Yes; but that is not the language of his country.

Mr. BENNET. I understand that.

Mr. BURNETT. It does not say "of his country."

Mr. BENNET. It may be some other European country.

Mr. BURNETT. Then I would understand that to mean that if he could read the language of any European country, whether his own or any other, he would be qualified.

Mr. SVARC. The situation arising under that act would be such that these poor people, who through no fault of theirs are illiterate, would be excluded; and I assure you, gentlemen, that they form one of the most valuable elements of our population. Take the Slovak race as a whole. I think I can safely say, without any hesitation, that it has formed one of the most valuable elements in our population. You can not complain of the distribution of the Slovak immigrants throughout this country. You will find them all over, extending from New York to San Francisco. You will find the Bohemian farmer scattered throughout Nebraska. You will find him in every county in Nebraska. You will find him in the broad fields of Iowa. You will find him in the Dakotas. You will find him in Minnesota, and you will find him in Wisconsin.

Mr. BURNETT. There are many of them in the district of my friend from Texas, Mr. Moore, and he tells me that they are very fine farmers.

Mr. SVARC. And you will find them in Texas. I wish to say that in my own home county of Cuyahoga, in the State of Ohio, they are moving away from the city to the farms in northern Ohio. They are going back to the soil. The Slovak is employed at some of the hardest kinds of labor. He works in the mines of Pennsylvania, and he works in the mines of Ohio and Illinois. When that great accident happened at Cherry, Ill., they became martyrs to their calling. You will find them working in the mines of upper Michigan. You will find them scattered throughout the whole breadth of this land, wherever hard work is required and wherever strong muscle and

brawn is needed. They are the later comers. But take the little nation of Slovenians—there are not very many of them even at home; but do you know that that little nation has, for instance, furnished three bishops of the Roman Catholic Church in Minnesota and in the Dakotas alone—a handful of people? These people are not newcomers, because they came over in the fifties, and settled up there in Minnesota. Of course their stream of immigration has been coming to us since that time. You will find the Croatians; you will find the Servians (people coming from what the restrictionists call southern Europe); you will find those handsome specimens of humanity, the Servians of Dalmatia, coming over here—men who tower 6 feet and more. Some of them are sailors—the finest specimens of manhood that come to our shores. When you seek to learn where they have gone you will find them working in the mines of the West; you will find them in Nevada, you will find them in Arizona, you will find them in Colorado, as well as throughout Pennsylvania.

These people are newcomers. They have not yet begun to leave the hard and arduous work which they have undertaken. But sooner or later they, too, are going to gravitate to a higher and better sphere. But as my predecessors have stated, besides brain, besides education, and all that, you have got to have men in this country who are going to do the hard and arduous work which some of us, I know, are not very prone to undertake. And in order that we may get this element, which is going to develop this country and which has been developing this country, I need not apologize for the Slovak immigrant, because I know that his presence has been a blessing and a boon to the country. I know from personal experience in my home city of Cleveland, Ohio, what the foreign immigrant has done there. That is a city three-fourths of the population of which, probably, is made up of the foreign born and their children—a city which you might say was built up by the immigrants. These very immigrants have made the city of Cleveland, Ohio, the metropolis of the State. They have made it the greatest city between New York and Chicago.

From the standpoint of sociology, I believe that those same immigrants will make a showing second to none in the matter of their personal conduct, in the matter of criminality, and all that. I do not care where you go, you will find that the Slovak immigrant contributes no more than can be expected of him as to criminality, as to pauperism, and all that.

I am often amused, in thinking about the complaint which is made against the immigrant generally, that he furnishes paupers and that he furnishes criminals, by the fact that these gentlemen who are criticising the immigrant from that standpoint fail to remember that the immigrant is only human. He is just as human as the native born. Being human, he has his criminals and he has his paupers. But, as has been so ably demonstrated before you here to-day by preceding speakers, the immigrant does not contribute any more toward pauperism and toward criminality than what is to be fairly expected. Bringing the energy that he does, bringing the intelligence that he does, bringing the brawn and bringing the muscle that he does, sooner or later he is bound to rise in the scale, and is bound to become a useful American citizen.

We must have in this country the drawers of water and the hewers of wood, and we are getting them. If the United States is to go on

and is to prosper, there should be no more restrictive legislation placed upon the books. We believe that the law as it now stands is more than sufficient if properly administered. And on behalf of the people whom I have the honor to represent here to-day, we protest against any further restrictive measures. We do it not from a selfish standpoint; we do it because we love this country of ours and we do it because we love humanity.

I thank you.

(After an informal discussion as to who should be the next speaker, it was announced that the committee had decided to limit the duration of each speech to fifteen minutes.)

STATEMENT OF MR. LEON SANDERS, OF NEW YORK CITY.

MR. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I appear before you as grand master of a Jewish fraternal organization having a membership of 134,000 persons living in different parts of the United States. The executive board of that organization, at a special meeting held last Monday night, adopted resolutions protesting against the passage of any restrictive immigration law, believing that the existing laws are in themselves sufficient to protect this country against undesirable immigrants, and that all that is required is a proper interpretation of the law in a humane sense. This organization has directed me to come here; and I am glad to be given the opportunity to express my views, particularly upon two of the questions that are under discussion.

One of those questions is in regard to the illiteracy test. I notice that the gentlemen who have spoken here to-day with regard to the illiteracy test have spoken on the subject as they understand it and as they know it. But none of them are born Russians, and they do not understand the conditions that prevail in Russia as I do, since I myself am an immigrant who arrived at this country something like twenty-eight or twenty-nine years ago. I was compelled to come here by the Russian "pogroms." I was obliged to flee from my native place, and all that I had with me was just my clothes. I came here to this strange land, a stranger among strangers, with no relatives or friends to help me. And if we had then had upon our statute books any such laws as are now sought to be placed there by the bills that are under consideration by your committee I feel that I would have been one of those unfortunates who would have been sent back to a place where I could not go without risking my life.

The illiteracy test is one to which we object, because we feel that it will be particularly harmful to those who have made our best citizens since they have arrived in this country. Under the laws of Russia the Jews are compelled to live within a certain pale—within certain settlements allotted to them. No school can be opened by them unless it receives the sanction of the Government. That sanction is very seldom given, and only a certain percentage of the Jews are permitted to take advantage of the schooling. The result is that only those who can afford to buy their way in or who can afford to bribe the officials have an opportunity to get an education. The others are compelled to pick up what education they can from their parents or older brothers or other relatives.

These people who have come here have become Americans by choice. They have come here to better their condition. They did not come here to exploit the country and get its benefits and send them back to Europe. They have come here to stay. They have given the best that there is in them to make this country greater and better.

Speaking for myself as one of these immigrants (as I said, I came here twenty-eight years ago), I have done my share, and I assume that I represent thousands of others who have done their share, to try and make this country a better country and a good country to live in. Many laws that now are on the statute books of the State of New York are laws that I had the honor of introducing, and which were passed at a time when I had the honor of serving in the legislature with Mr. Bennet, of your committee. Since then I have been elevated to the bench. An opportunity was given to me such as is given to every one of those who came here with the intention of becoming American citizens, becoming Americanized, and imbibing the full spirit of our American institutions.

We object to this illiteracy test, as I say, for the reason that it is going to work a hardship upon those who make up our best citizenship. It will keep away from this country thousands of people who are seeking America as an asylum, and are seeking to give all that they have to give—their brain, their brawn—for the purpose of developing the resources of the country.

As to the head tax, I can not understand that this country is in such a bankrupt condition that it requires a tax from the poorest of the poor—those who come here to better their condition—in order to help meet its expenses. If a head tax is intended for the purpose of preventing undesirables coming here, it needs no argument on my part to show its futility. Those who come here who have succeeded in robbing their neighbors are very well able to pay a head tax, but for the man who flees with nothing but his life to have the gates of America shut in his face because he has not sufficient money will be a crying outrage. It is entirely un-American. It is something that no man proud of his citizenship in this country can countenance.

We object to the bill for these reasons. We feel that the Congress of the United States ought not to be false to the traditions of this nation—that there is room enough in the United States for all those who seek this country as an asylum, for all those who flee from the oppressor's hand, and there are plenty of localities where they can improve the country and at the same time improve their own condition.

I have traveled somewhat through the United States. I have seen where our people live. I have seen the opportunities of which they have taken advantage, and I know that everywhere they have made the best kind of citizens. Everywhere they have mingled with the people, and have become Americans in spirit and in every possible way. Our people do not permit immigrants to become subjects for public charitable institutions. In the city of New York we do all that we can to prevent congestion. We do all that we can to prevent them from becoming public charges. The Hebrew Shelter and Immigrant Aid Society, of which I have the honor of being president, and which has charge of the Jewish immigrants that come through the port of New York, maintains an immigrant home, where the immi-

grants who are permitted to land are given a place where they sleep, are given meals, and are given employment. If they have not any trade, we try to teach them a trade; and we keep them there until they become self-supporting. We try to send them out through various portions of the country.

If you gentlemen who reside in New York, or who have occasion to come to New York, would visit our place on Monday and Thursday nights, you would see hundreds of immigrants sitting there listening to lectures as to the opportunities to be had in other portions of the country outside of the city of New York. You would see the stereopticon views that are shown to them of large cities outside of New York. Many of them imagine that New York City is the whole of the United States of America. When they are shown these things the result is that thousands of them leave New York. Many of them take advantage of the opportunities given to them by the organization to which our friend Mr. Sulzberger refers, because they require financial aid to help them go to certain places outside of New York. In the case of those who have their own funds, thousands of them go to different portions of the country; and everywhere we hear nothing but good reports about them.

We strenuously object, as much as we possibly can, to the enactment of any laws which will have a tendency to restrict immigration. The laws are good enough as they are. All that we require is humane interpretation. All that we require is to have at the head of the Department of Commerce and Labor, and as its representatives, men who have hearts—hearts that feel for the unfortunate; hearts that will not keep out of the country the desirables, and will not shut in the face of the oppressed of the peoples of Europe the opportunities that they can have here. We want them there. The country has lost nothing by immigration. The country has gained; and there is lots of room for them.

STATEMENT OF MR. ABRAM I. ELKUS, OF NEW YORK CITY.

Mr. ELKUS. Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, with your permission I should like to take up and answer one or two questions which were asked by members of the committee with reference to the working of the present act and its administration. That subject is germane to the present inquiry, because after you hear what I have to say from actual experience of how the present act operates you will readily see how much more serious and how much more difficult and oppressive will be the operation of the proposed act.

In the first place, as you all know, in the present act we have a provision that a man shall not be admitted who is liable to become a public charge. I propose to touch lightly upon one or two cases which have come within my own personal experience, and give you the facts about them in order that you may see how that provision operates.

A man came to this country who was 33 years old, and had a wife and two children, whom he left in Russia. He only had with him \$4.95. He was in splendid health. He was excluded on the ground that he was liable to become a public charge. An appeal was taken in his case to the Secretary of Commerce and Labor. The appeal

was not sustained; it was dismissed. When we came to look into that case, what do you suppose we found? That while the man had only that amount of money with him, he owned in Russia (a most unusual thing) the house he lived in and land that was worth over 4,000 rubles (about \$2,000), and that he told the immigration commissioner: "If you will let me cable home, I can have \$500 remitted to me by cable." Yet that man was excluded; and he was on the ship, about to be deported and sent back as an undesirable alien, when, with the intervention with the writ of habeas corpus, we forced the commissioner to admit him.

That was only one of four cases which we took up as test cases. We picked out four cases at random from a batch of over 50 men, I think, who were ordered to be deported.

Mr. BURNETT. Was this man a Jew?

Mr. ELKUS. He was.

Mr. BURNETT. A Russian Jew?

Mr. ELKUS. A Russian Jew.

Mr. BURNETT. I thought in Russia they did not permit them to own land.

Mr. ELKUS. I thought so, too; but he owned it. In some parts of Russia, I believe, they can.

Mr. SANDERS. Within the pale?

Mr. ELKUS. Within the pale; yes.

Mr. BENNET. And in certain cities within the pale.

Mr. ELKUS. Another man of that lot had only a few dollars in money, but he had left a business at home——

Mr. MARSHALL. It is a leasehold. In certain places they have no right to own the land itself, but they have a leasehold interest.

Mr. ELKUS. Anyway, there was not any doubt that he had that money; and after the commissioner of immigration in New York had investigated the facts he consented to his admission. Through some hugger-muggery of the law they withdrew their order of deportation (although somebody said it could not be done), and those men are now useful residents of this country.

There was at the same time another case of a man who was excluded because he had only a few dollars with him. He was young, able-bodied, active, and belonged to a skilled trade; yet he was excluded. It was found that he had a large and successful business in Russia. He was a representative of the best class of immigrants that come here, yet he was excluded under that elastic phrase, that he was "liable to become a public charge."

What would have happened if we had had the "economically undesirable" clause in addition?

Mr. SABATH. Will you pardon me right here?

Mr. ELKUS. Certainly.

Mr. SABATH. I understand, Mr. Elkus, that you are a lawyer?

Mr. ELKUS. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. I had a case brought to my attention only about three weeks ago, where 20 Bulgarians arrived in Galveston, Tex., the youngest 18 years of age, the oldest 35. They were all able-bodied. They had more than \$800 among them (about \$40 apiece), or somewhere near that amount. They were deported, because the commissioner there ruled that they were liable to become a public charge, because there was no immediate demand for them there.

Mr. ELKUS. I will tell you something worse than that, sir.

Mr. SABATH. Do you think that was a proper and fair and just ruling on the part of the officials of the immigration department?

Mr. ELKUS. I certainly do not; and I will tell you a worse case than that.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Elkus, I know that you have studied this law more particularly recently. Do you find anything in the law that justifies a board of inquiry to pass on the question as to whether there is an economic demand for the immigrant in the place of landing?

Mr. ELKUS. No, sir; I do not. Not only that, but I say that no higher official has such a right. I told the Secretary so, and Mr. McHarg said to me: "I would admit some of these men if they were going somewhere else than to New York." I said: "How do you know they are going to stay in New York? The fact that they say they have a cousin or a brother-in-law somewhere in New York or in Philadelphia does not prove that they are going to stay there. What business is it of yours, because you think they will be useful in some other part of the United States, to determine that you will admit them if they will go there, even if they have not got a dollar?" He said: "Well, I never looked at it in that way." But the point was this, and the whole trouble arose in this way, and you will see just what would happen if we had a statute containing such loose language as the one referred to here:

The commissioner in New York issued an order—we call it a rule, but he said it was an "intimation"—which was practically to the effect that no immigrant should come here and be admitted who did not have \$25 in cash with him. He said: "I am going to raise the standard of inspection." Well, of course, after that broad "intimation" (if you want to be polite about it) every immigration inspector went to work and began to see how many immigrants he could keep out: Instead of asking these men, as was their duty, questions which would bring out all the facts, they asked them the bald and naked question: "How much money have you got with you?" If you take a poor Russian immigrant, coming over here after going through what he has gone through with the Russian officials, and ask him how much money he has with him, which is usually followed by "Show it to me and give it to me," what do you think the result will be? Why, naturally, most of those men, even if they had a couple of hundred dollars in their pockets, would say, "Four dollars and ninety-seven cents," because they would be afraid the next question of this uniformed official would be, "How much of it can I have? or you can not get in."

Mr. SABATH. That also applies to the Poles that come in here, and to others, does it not?

Mr. ELKUS. Every one of them. I do not mean to limit it to Jews or to Russians. It applies to every one of that kind of men.

When the inspectors got that "intimation" from the head of the office, they began to see if they could not live up to it. Commissioner Williams himself, after he got through investigating these cases on the facts that were laid before him, told me that one of the great troubles of his office was that his subordinates were not sufficiently competent to fulfill their duties. I said: "Then why do you not permit these men, who are on trial, really, for their liberty"—

because it means liberty for them to enter this country—"to have counsel down here, who would bring out these facts?" If you will read the records in those cases, you will find that they are enough to astound any man who is used to a fair trial or a fair hearing on any question. They ask the baldest, simplest questions; and then they throw the burden on the poor immigrant, and say to him: "Why didn't you prove these facts?" They expect him to do that, with no knowledge of the law, with no knowledge of his rights, with no permission to have anybody to help him.

So much for that.

Mr. BENNET. And a prohibition in the rules against any lawyer charging him more than \$10.

Mr. ELKUS. We can give him all the lawyers he wants, because there are so many of us in New York—among others yourself, Mr. Bennet, or Judge Goldfogle—who would be only too glad to help any deserving immigrant who wants to come in. That ten-dollar limitation may be a good thing and it may be a bad one; but we are not quarreling with that so much as we are with the fact that a lawyer is prohibited from going down there when the man is on trial and assisting him in the way a lawyer best can assist a man—by bringing out all the facts.

One of the gentlemen asked here what was being done in New York toward making these men go out on the farms, teaching them to be farmers, and teaching them trades. That is a work that I have been particularly connected with, as one of the trustees of the Baron de Hirsh fund. I wish you gentlemen who think nothing is being done to make the young Jew from the East Side a farmer would come to Woodbine, N. J., some day, and see that farm school there. I wish you would come and see these young men from the much-defamed East Side of New York—young men from 18 to 25 years of age, who have saved up enough money, earned by hard work, to be able to go there and learn to become farmers, or farmers' assistants, farmers' helpers. They stay there six months or a year, or two years, and graduate to the number of 75 a year, and go out all over the country as farmers' assistants. I wish you could read the letters the superintendent of that school has, not alone from these boys, but from their employers, asking for more help of the same kind, and praising those that have been sent to them. I wish you could read the letters from the boys themselves, from all over the country, telling of their successful life as farmers. So great has been the success, not alone of the school, but of the boys as farmers' assistants, that the superintendent wrote me the other day that he had found places a month before graduation for every boy who graduated this spring. The superintendent (a man of education and character and learning) is a Russian refugee, who fled from Russia by reason of one of the "pogroms" which have been alluded to here. He is a man of the highest culture and the finest type, who landed here without a dollar in his clothes. I suppose if he came to-day, or a few days ago, he would be excluded because he did not have \$25, on the ground that he was liable to become a public charge.

Mr. SABATH. That would apply to two members of this committee.

Mr. ELKUS. Yes, sir; and it would have applied to my own father. My father came here, and he did not stay in New York, either. He went down to Alabama.

Mr. BURNETT. To Alabama?

Mr. ELKUS. Yes, sir; he went to Mobile, Ala.

We have another school in New York—a trade school. It is not a school where we turn out, at the end of four or five years, skilled mechanics, or gentlemen who are fit to be superintendents; but after a course of training of six months as machinists, as electricians, as carpenters, or as painters, the pupils are turned out to become journeymen. And I should like to refer here to the argument or suggestion that has been made that these men cut down the wages of the others. As a matter of fact, they all become members of unions.

A typical instance of what is accomplished by the young men who go through that school was shown the other day. In 1904 a young man came to this country, a Roumanian Jew, at the age of 18. He entered that school in 1905. He was there six months, taking the course as an electrical worker, and graduated. He wrote the other day that at the time he entered he earned \$4 a week as an errand boy. When he left he was able to earn \$12 a week as an assistant electrician. A year afterwards he wrote that he had joined the union, and was receiving \$5 or \$5.50 a day. And the other day he wrote that he had successfully passed a competitive examination, and had received a position in Chicago, as an electrical instructor, at a salary of \$2,000 a year. There is the case of a poor Roumanian Jew coming to this country, absolutely ignorant, not knowing anything at the age of 18, and now, at the age of 23, he has achieved that distinction.

Mr. SABATH. I wish to add that Chicago does appreciate all these people, and appreciates their work. It is always easy for them to obtain such positions in our great city.

Mr. ELKUS. I am very glad to hear it.

I think the cry about congestion that has been so much uttered is really very much of a false alarm. There are many Jewish farmers in and about New Jersey; and I know of many instances where they have been successful farmers. I was told the other day of a farmer near Woodbine, a Russian refugee, a man with five or six children, who had been farming down there, I believe, for five or six years on a farm of 15 acres, and had managed to support himself and his family nicely. He had his own home, and had saved a thousand dollars in one year. That is the type of Jewish farmer that is going around the country; and I think it is a type that ought to be encouraged.

Now, gentlemen, the hour is late, and there are others who want to speak.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. You can go on, Mr. Elkus, if you have anything further.

Mr. ELKUS. I have just a few more words.

Mr. BENNET. May I ask you a question, Mr. Elkus?

Mr. ELKUS. Surely.

Mr. BENNET. Is not the question as to where these people go very largely an economic question—a question of supply and demand?

Mr. ELKUS. Very much so; and it is also a question of getting to this country and finding out, after they get here, what can be done. And that leads me right to a topic I want to touch upon: I think it was one of the provisions of the immigration law that a compilation of the statutes and of the decisions should be made from time to

time. There has not been one made for many years—I think for nine or ten years. That has caused a great deal of misinformation to be given to immigrants or intending immigrants, not only before they leave their native country, but after they arrive here. They do not know exactly of the possibilities and the probabilities of this country. If some information—not rose-colored or gold-colored, but plain, concise information—could be given to intending immigrants in their native land as to the possibilities of success in different parts of this country, there would not be any problem of congestion worth talking about.

As Mr. Marshall said, and as Mr. Sulzberger pointed out, these men have not any particular desire to stay in one city, or in one State, or in one part of the country. They would just as soon make their homes in the West or in the South. No doubt you have all had that called to your attention by reason of the immigration to Galveston. They go there in great numbers, now that they have been diverted there by means of private enterprise.

Why should not this Government, through some one of its officials, and through proper channels, disseminate such information in a broader and wider and a more authoritative way, so that more of these immigrants—not alone Russians or Jews, but those from all parts of Europe—would go to those parts of the country that the Government thinks need immigration?

The fact that the country needs immigrants for its work has been amply demonstrated. There can not be any question that certain parts of the country need immigrants. I was told by the managers of several of the New England mills that they welcome the immigrants there as workers in the mills; that they have found that they rapidly become Americanized and become citizens.

As to their becoming Americanized and becoming citizens in New York, it is only necessary to go to any of the public schools, the night schools, and the private schools that are provided by the educational alliance, to see how eager, how anxious, how more than willing, every one of these men and women and children is, not only to become acquainted with our language and our customs, but to become thoroughly acquainted with the spirit of Americanism and to try their best to become American citizens of the real type. That they value their franchise when they get it is beyond dispute, because it is the great East Side that over and over again has decided municipal elections and presidential elections. There they think before they vote. No party can claim them absolutely as its own, because they, of all men, since they never had the right to exercise the franchise before they came here, really value it.

That they read at times newspapers printed in other than the English language, is so. One man said to me, when I spoke with him on the subject: "I work from 7 in the morning until 8 at night. I have learned English with great difficulty, because I came here when I was over 40 years old. I would like to read the English newspapers, but I find it difficult to read when I am tired. I want to know what is going on in this country, however, and so I read what I can read easily." But each day he had set for himself a task of reading something in English, so as to force himself to learn it. So eager was he for knowledge of passing events—and he showed by his conversation with me in English how much he knew of what was

going on in the world—that not only did he read the stint he had set for himself in English, but he read the Yiddish newspaper. He did that so that he might know what was going on.

Is not that man to be encouraged? Is he to be forced (if we could force him to do so) to read only something that with difficulty he understands after his long day's work?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. These papers printed in Yiddish, to which you have reference, are well edited, mold public opinion, tend toward the Americanization of the people who read them, convey to them the news of the day, and in other respects operate to inform their readers, just as do the papers published in English. Their publishers have the means to carry on the papers; they receive the news over the telegraphic wires just as do the other papers. In short, they are regular newspapers of street and stand and mail circulation. Is not that so?

Mr. ELKUS. Entirely so; entirely so.

There is one other subject that I wish to touch upon, and then I shall have finished.

Mr. ADAIR. Just a moment. I may have been misunderstood by you when I asked one of the other gentlemen as to what effort was made to instruct and teach these people to read the English newspapers. I did not mean to say, or even to insinuate, or have it understood that I thought that they ought not to be permitted to read newspapers published in any language. I think they should. I think that if they are not able to read the English language, they should read newspapers published in the language they can read, in order that they may know what is going on in the country. Under no consideration would I take their newspapers away from them. I would be with their newspapers like I would be with Judge Goldfogle's tobacco. I would not want to take his tobacco away from him. I suppose he has a right to chew if he wants to chew. [Laughter.]

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I do not happen to smoke. [Laughter.]

Mr. ADAIR. I am very willing that they shall have their own newspapers and read them. I only asked the question so that I might know what effort was made toward encouraging them to take up the English language and be able to read the English language.

Mr. ELKUS. Why, every effort is made. I think the best evidence of their desire to learn is this: I should think the person who would be least likely to have the time or the inclination to study a foreign language would be a woman who came to this country at the age of 30 or 35, who is the mother of 4 or 5 children, and who has little or no spare time. Yet, if you will go to the Educational Alliance in New York City on certain hours in the morning, you will find large classes of those women, those mothers, stealing away the hours from their children to come and learn not only English, but American customs and American ideas.

Mr. ADAIR. That is very commendable indeed.

Mr. BENNET. Just describe how large a building that Educational Alliance is.

Mr. ELKUS. It is a 5-story building at the corner of Jefferson street and East Broadway.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Yes; at Jefferson street and East Broadway. It is in my district.

Mr. ELKUS. I suppose it is about 50 by 150.

Mr. SABATH. It is about the same size as our Jewish Institute in Chicago.

Mr. ELKUS. You took away our superintendent. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARSHALL. And it is used so much that the stairs, which are stone, are badly worn.

Mr. ELKUS. Yes; the stone stairs are worn through.

Mr. BENNET. And the building is devoted entirely to educational purposes.

Mr. ELKUS. I want to give you an idea of the boys' zeal for Americanism. In the village of Woodbine everybody is a Jew. Even the policeman is a Jew. They have a fire company there; they have everything to teach the children civic pride and the whole American idea; and they run it very well. They have a boys' school there, outside of the public schools, to teach them the elements of the Jewish language and the Jewish religion. The little boys—8, 10, and 12 years old, and under 13—had a teacher there who only spoke Yiddish; and the boys would not go to the school until they got a teacher who spoke to them in English. [Laughter.]

Mr. SABATH. That is good.

Mr. ELKUS. They said they would not talk Yiddish any more; they were Americans. That is the spirit of it; and it is a true example of what the real spirit of these boys is. You never saw in your whole life anybody more anxious to get rid of the Russian taint than these boys and these men and women who come from Russia; and it is that spirit which pervades all of them who come here.

Why should you put such tests upon those children, or their brothers or sisters or fathers who want to come here, to try and keep them out? If you make any such provision in an act as that anybody who is "economically undesirable" is to be kept out, just imagine what is going to take place at Ellis Island! The three immigration inspectors will solemnly convene. Inspector So-and-so will say: "Mister, how much money have you got in your clothes?" The man will say: "I have got a dollar and ninety-eight cents; I have got fine health and constitution, and I am a carpenter by trade." "Excluded as economically undesirable!" Or perhaps he has not a certificate of good moral character. There has been some reference made to certificates of good moral character. From what I know and from what I have read (and I am sure those of you who have been to Russia will agree with me), I assume that those certificates will be framed and ready for sale, and the price will be according to the frame that goes around them. If it is gilt-edged, it will cost so much. If it is only framed in plain wood, it will cost so much less. [Laughter.]

Mr. BENNET. There will not be any framed in plain wood.

Mr. ELKUS. No; they will insist on something more expensive.

Mr. BURNETT. There is nothing in the law, I believe, that requires any framing.

Mr. ELKUS. The frame will be the ornamentation for which the charge will be made.

Mr. BURNETT. That will show that they are economically desirable? [Laughter.]

Mr. ELKUS. Yes, sir. That will be the economical part of it.

Another suggestion was made here by one of the members of the committee who is not here now; but I will answer it anyhow. He

asked with some particularity as to whether or not the immigrants who came here did not have a feeling of resentment against the Government. He did not put it quite as strongly as that, but that they were rather gathered together here with a feeling of some sort against the law. It is my experience, from seeing some of these men, and from what I have learned from others—because I know a great many who have given up their time, and some of them have really given up their lives, to work among the poor and these people on the East Side of the city who are recent immigrants—that there are no more law-abiding people anywhere than the Russian immigrants and the Roumanian immigrants. They respect the law. They are tenacious of their rights when they believe they are right; but they are easily handled. In the case of the shirt-waist strike, which was referred to, I was told by one of the ladies who was interested in them that these girls who had lately landed in this country showed the most surprising knowledge of the law and of their rights; and not only that, but they showed a strict desire to live entirely within them. So I think I can say without exaggeration or fear of contradiction that all these immigrants absolutely respect the law, respect its spirit, and obey it.

In the last twenty years the city of New York has made wonderful strides in commercial success and in advancement, not only from a money standpoint but from an artistic standpoint. Twenty years ago we had large tracts of land on the outskirts of the city that were wastes and deserts. They are now peopled by hundreds and thousands and hundreds of thousands of citizens—respectable, hard-working, obeying the law. Most of those are Russian immigrants and Roumanian immigrants, or their descendants. Who can say but that the great success of the city of New York is due to the much-despised Russian and Roumanian immigrant, or the immigrant who comes from Europe? Who can say that without them those desolate places would now be so thickly populated by men who have done so much to add to the wealth of the country?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Generally speaking, the immigrants have contributed to the welfare and the upbuilding of the city; have they not?

Mr. ELKUS. Undoubtedly.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. That applies generally to them all?

Mr. ELKUS. The Italians, the Germans, and so on.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Why, certainly.

Mr. ELKUS. Look at the great parts of the city that the Germans have built up, and that the Italians have built up. There is one section in the city of New York, on the upper east side, that is almost entirely populated by Italians. They, too, a great majority of them, become law-abiding citizens of the community.

I thank you, gentlemen, for listening to me so patiently at this late hour.

Mr. SABATH. I desire to ask you one more question, if you will permit me.

Mr. ELKUS. Certainly.

Mr. SABATH. I have observed (and, in fact, every one else has) that our trade and our exports have been increasing wonderfully, and that we are to-day doing business in every corner of the world. Do you not believe the fact that we have people in this country who are familiar with the various languages in itself aids us in reaching and doing business with the different nationalities and different sections

of the world, through the fact that we can send our agents out to do business with these various countries who speak their own language?

Mr. ELKUS. Undoubtedly.

Mr. SABATH. I have noticed an article in the report of Mr. Barrett, the director of the Bureau of South American Republics, in which he does not by any means discourage people from learning various languages; in fact, he encourages it. He believes that if the people were familiar with the languages that are spoken in the South American Republics, it would aid us a great deal in enlarging our business with the South American Republics. Are you of the same opinion?

Mr. ELKUS. I am. Undoubtedly it facilitates business—the familiarity, not only with languages, but with methods of procedure, which is obtained by intercourse with those countries.

STATEMENT OF MR. MAX J. KOHLER, OF NEW YORK CITY.

Mr. KOHLER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, we have heard something said about the effects of the present administration of the law. As an attorney, and a member of the advisory board of the organization of which Judge Sanders is the president, and also, years ago, as assistant United States district attorney in New York, I have had occasion to give quite a little attention to that branch of the law.

We notice, first of all, that according to the reports of the Commissioner-General of Immigration, 10,000 persons, roughly speaking, were excluded last year, about the same number the year before, and about 13,000 the year before that. In this connection I wish to refer to the group of cases that Mr. Elkus referred to—these habeas corpus cases of which we were going to make test cases, and would have done so but for the fact that the Government took our test cases away by admitting the men. We wanted a construction by the courts of the words “person likely to become a public charge.” But the men were discharged between adjournments. Those cases show that the greatest amount of misunderstanding prevails in administrative circles to-day, and also on the part of the immigrants, or prospective immigrants abroad, as to what our law requires.

I fully agree with Mr. Elkus that even now a great many persons are improperly excluded. I have here the reports of that society covering about 25 separate cases out of about 130 excluded cases. In each of the 25 cases, on a proper test of the law, if we could have gotten into court, the men would have been admitted, as having been excluded without rhyme or reason. But the law makes those decisions nonreviewable unless you can show an utter lack of due process of law. But assuming (as is undoubtedly true) that the large majority, say, 75 per cent, of those exclusions are justified, those persons ought to have an opportunity before they come over here to know what our law is.

Congress has had that matter in mind several times. In the last immigration act, the act of 1907, in section 1, it was expressly provided that some of this head-tax money should be utilized for the publication of digests of the decisions of the courts upon the immigration laws. We find the same provision in an earlier act—section 1 of the act of 1903. Curiously enough, the digest has never been published, notwithstanding the mandate of Congress on each of those

occasions. There is to-day no recent government compilation containing even the determinations of the courts or of the bureaus of the Government as to the meaning (very often more or less uncertain, as applied in practice) of such words as "pauper," "person likely to become a public charge," and the prepaid-ticket provisions. There is no compilation giving those constructions later than one published in 1899 by the Treasury Department, which I sought for in vain in every public office in New York and in the libraries there.

So much is that provision of law observed. It is most important that the meaning of these terms, as they have been construed by the courts and the department, should be made known abroad, so that an immigrant who is debarred by those provisions may know what our law is. It was certainly the purpose of Congress to have this or similar compilations published before the persons are allowed or induced to come over here. They do not want to waste all their substance and their time in coming here if they are likely to be debarred. They ought to have an opportunity of knowing what our law is; and the mandate of Congress ought to be observed in those respects. Unfortunately, the amendment that was made last year, I think, which provided that the head tax should be turned into Congress in general instead of being kept as a separate fund, may possibly justify the present position that there is no necessary mandate.

Mr. BENNET. That appropriation expressly provided that it was for the purpose of carrying out the act of 1907.

Mr. KOHLER. Oh, there is no question about that. It ought to be done. It is probably merely an oversight. Nobody has been interested in the matter. Incidentally, if we had a compilation of that kind, it would be valuable also to the government officers, because it would show them what the courts and the highest authorities in the department have said as to the proper meaning of these more or less indefinite terms of the law. Ever since the famous Massachusetts bill of rights it has been recognized that this is a government of law, and not of men; and where can we get proper judicial and other authoritative constructions of these indefinite terms aside from the courts and authoritative decisions based upon them? So it is most important that we should have that done.

While I have given you the number of exclusions here, it is interesting to note a matter that seems to have been quite overlooked. In the report of the Commissioner General of Immigration for 1907 he calls attention to the remarkable fact (I have the exact reference to it here; it is on page 83) that 65,000 persons were refused tickets abroad because of the presence of the medical defects which the law specifies, as disclosed by the examination of the steamship companies there. That is five times as many as were excluded here. That refers only to medical defects. As to the rest of the possible reasons for exclusion—that they may be paupers, or that they may be persons likely to become a public charge, or that they may be subject to the so-called prepaid-ticket provisions of the law—they are never even disclosed to the poor immigrant, particularly the Russian Jew, who has to cross the frontier clandestinely to get here at all. He certainly is not going to get correct and good advice on that point from the runners of the steamship companies that may help

him across the border. So this very important matter would simply tend in the direction of enforcing our own law; but it has simply been neglected and disregarded, as many other provisions for the benefit of the immigrant unfortunately have been.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Kohler, this number of 65,000 represents only intending immigrants who have paid for their steamship tickets in whole or in part; so there is no index at all as to the much greater number that have been refused permission to even buy tickets. These are the names that were scratched off of the manifests after the tickets were purchased.

Mr. KOHLER. I was not even aware of that. The report of the Industrial Commission of 1891 shows that in a prior year there were 50,000 such cases, according to the Government's calculations; but that only deals with those where the medical examination disclosed the defect. They ought, in common decency, to be advised of what our law is. Incidentally, as I have attempted to point out, it would also have the effect of enlightening a great many of our subordinate immigration inspectors as to their duties.

Mr. BURNETT. Let me ask you a question there, Mr. Kohler. Who furnished that information?

Mr. KOHLER. The Government itself made an investigation of the matter.

Mr. BENNET. Do you mean in the case of those 65,000?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. BENNET. They took them from the manifest lists as they came from the countries where the law requires that there shall be thirty names on the list. There were thirty names, but a good many of the names were stricken off. They were refused after the purchase of the ticket because they were inadmissible.

Mr. BURNETT. If that is true, if the steamship companies went to the trouble to do that, why should they not furnish the information as to the other causes for which others were turned back? Why could they not have done that just as easily?

Mr. KOHLER. They are penalized as to one matter, viz, bringing diseased aliens over here. They are not penalized for the other, and have not any interest in the other.

Mr. BURNETT. As to those coming under contract and all those things?

Mr. KOHLER. They are penalized if they knowingly bring people here under those conditions, yes; but not where they bring them and simply close their eyes to what an examination might disclose.

Mr. BENNET. You have to prove that they knew it.

Mr. BURNETT. I should think, if you got it from the manifest, that that would disclose the whole number that were turned back.

Mr. BENNET. No; it discloses only those that paid for their tickets, and thus got on the ship; but when they came to be examined at the ports of embarkation abroad it was found that the steamship company would be fined if they were brought here, and they struck their names from the list and gave them their passage money back. There were 65,000 of them.

Mr. SABATH. That worked a hardship on these people, did it not?

Mr. BENNET. Why, of course. Some of them came three or four hundred miles to get to the ship.

Mr. SABATH. Should not the steamship companies inform these people beforehand, before they accept any money from them, before the people part with their homes and with all that they have?

Mr. BENNET. You will find that in almost every foreign country they are now attempting to reach exactly that situation by statute. Under the Austrian statute, in the year 1907, I think there were something like 100 steamship agents sent to jail for violating the law of Austria in just those particulars.

Mr. KOHLER. But the indefinite provisions of our statute are such that we ought to have constructions by the courts, or other authoritative officials, such as were published by the Treasury Department in 1899 in the document I referred to, but not since, notwithstanding the mandate of Congress.

There is a great deal of mistake and blunder, working great injustice to the immigrant, in connection with the so-called prepaid-ticket provision. When that was reported to Congress some language was used which throws more light upon the matter than anything else I know of. I will read a few lines from that. It is from the report of the committee on the act of 1891, page 4:

Those assisted by friends from this side of the water are the best class of immigrants, for they have relatives or friends who will care for them in their untried surroundings. But the immigrant assisted from the other side usually has no friends here; and if any on the other side, their chief interest is in getting rid of what is likely soon to become a burden.

The report goes on to say that the assisted-ticket immigrant should not be put in a prohibited class, but that our experience has been so unfortunate that it would seem prudent that he should be required to show affirmatively that he does not belong to one of the excluded classes.

That was the intent of the law. It was very badly phrased, though; and this is the way it works in practice:

First of all, the law says that persons shall come over here subject to the burden of affirmatively proving their right to come, when their ticket was purchased with the money of another. What does that mean? The more intelligent man, who has relatives and friends here, who sends his money here to them to buy the ticket, presents a ticket bought here. At once it is said, "Here is a ticket bought in this country; it has been paid for by the money of another," though the immigrant himself may have sent it—which is, of course, utter folly. Our laws throw some safeguards on the purchase of tickets, and still we have this ridiculous blunder.

Next, the law did not contemplate that if a man borrows money on his own property, that is a ticket paid for with the money of another.

But waiving that, and the uncertainty as to what that provision means, we come to the next clause, which has caused the utmost folly. The law simply says that the burden shall be upon such alien to show affirmatively that he is not within any of the prohibited classes. The law, however, does not give counsel to the poor alien coming over here ignorant of our language and of our laws. It does not tell him beforehand what our law is. And I actually heard it seriously stated by an inspector of immigration at Ellis Island that when he attempted to question an immigrant holding a prepaid ticket as to whether he did or did not belong to any of these pro-

hibited classes, he was reproved and told: "Why, the laws says he must affirmatively show that, and you have no business to assume the burden for him."

When we have such extraordinary conditions as that, we see how important it is to have a fair and proper administration of the law, which would work for the benefit of those desiring to exclude undesirables as well as avoid this gross injustice that is now being done to a great many deserving immigrants.

I come next to the bonding provision, about which I want to say a few words. The bill which you have under consideration follows in part, at least, the recommendations of the Commissioner-General of Immigration, in which he says that in general immigrants should not be permitted to land on bond; and he points out two arguments which are deserving of serious consideration against the taking of bonds. He says that the pecuniary responsibility of the bondsman is often doubtful; and he says, in addition to that, that the people frequently disappear, change their names, and are lost track of.

With regard to the first objection, it is the simplest thing in the world to require proper bonds. The constitutional right to bail may be thwarted in the same way, but I do not think a court will have much patience with that. It is perfectly capable of requiring only a surety company bond or a proper real estate bond with large equity. That is an abuse that can be very easily disposed of in administration.

Next, with regard to the claim that the people disappear. As an administrative matter, it is the simplest thing in the world to insert a clause in the bond that the person shall report periodically, every six months or a year, and forfeit the bond if he does not do it.

Mr. BURNETT. Report to whom?

Mr. KOHLER. To the immigration officials who have charge of the bond, or anyone else who may be designated.

Mr. BURNETT. Suppose he is in Minnesota, a thousand miles away?

Mr. KOHLER. The Government has officers at every place, every port and every city. It is easy to arrange that.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Kohler, that provision in the report is purely speculative. There never has been a case in the history of Europe where they have endeavored to enforce a bond where they have met with any of these difficulties that they anticipate may arise.

Mr. BURNETT. Have they ever enforced them?

Mr. BENNET. Oh, yes; they have enforced them on a few occasions.

Mr. KOHLER. There is a very able opinion by Mr. Justice Brown in a case in the Federal Reporter; and there have been cases for nearly one hundred years in Massachusetts and in New York involving those bonds, and they have been repeatedly enforced. When a doubtful case is presented—and there are many of them—that is the best possible guaranty against the person's becoming a public charge. Some one else with adequate means is made surety for the man, to help him along. Why should not such a bond be taken literally and fairly, instead of speculating as to the man's possibly becoming a public charge?

Mr. BURNETT. What kind of bonds have you to suggest—the bond of a guaranty company or the bond of an individual surety?

Mr. KOHLER. I think it would be proper to require a surety company bond or an adequate bond from the owner of real estate having

an adequate equity in it—such, for instance, as is required in criminal cases under our New York penal code.

Mr. BURNETT. If you have an individual surety, it is often the case that the individual becomes bankrupt. If you require a guaranty company bond, it would impose an almost impossible hardship on all the immigrants.

Mr. BENNET. Oh, no; they are furnishing these bonds right along.

Mr. KOHLER. The surety companies are freely giving such bonds; and it is not once in a thousand or ten thousand cases that an individual surety becomes bankrupt. That is an ordinary business risk that everyone takes in other things.

Mr. SABATH. Why should not the same kind of a bond be accepted by an immigration commissioner or the immigration authorities that is accepted by various state courts and other courts, viz, a real-estate bond?

Mr. KOHLER. I think it ought to be.

Mr. SABATH. Why should the authorities, as Mr. Burnett says, impose this additional burden upon these people who are not in a condition to pay the fee? I have been informed that some of the insurance companies and bonding companies charge as much as \$40 to sign such bonds. I should like to know whether that is really being enforced now or not.

Mr. BENNET. There is no statute requiring surety company bonds.

Mr. SABATH. Why should an order be given that only a surety company bond will be accepted?

Mr. BENNET. There is no such law.

Mr. SABATH. I know there is no such law; but such an order has been given, as I understand.

Mr. BURNETT. By whom?

Mr. SABATH. By the commissioner, Mr. Williams, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. KOHLER. It is practically impossible to get any bonds taken to-day except surety company bonds.

Mr. BENNET. That is true.

Mr. KOHLER. But there is no law about it.

Mr. BENNET. There is no law about it; and the only man who has any say about it is the Secretary of Commerce and Labor.

Mr. KOHLER. And to-day, in the United States circuit court of appeals for the second circuit, in New York, a case is being reargued in which the claim is made (which I think is likely to be sustained) that the department to-day is unjustifiably and unreasonably and contrary to law refusing individual bonds almost invariably, misled by this specious reasoning to which I have referred.

I just want to say one word more in connection with the illiteracy test that has been referred to. It has been commonly thought among almost all persons familiar with the Jewish immigrants, particularly, that there are practically no male Jews in this country who are illiterate. The figures given in the report of the Commissioner-General of Immigration show that there is an appreciable percentage, as was shown to-day. This is due to the fact that in Russia, particularly, the Government studiously refuses to permit them to get the education they want. Our private agencies here do everything conceivable to help those immigrants along. They acquire a knowledge of Eng-

lish or other languages—chiefly English—so rapidly that the impression upon those that I have referred to is that there are none. I happen to be an honorary secretary of the Baron de Hirsch fund. The work that we subsidize in the Educational Alliance for immigrant classes has been referred to, but we now have similar classes in every large place in the country where there are Jewish inhabitants. We subsidize classes in Boston; we subsidize classes in Philadelphia; we subsidize them in Baltimore; we subsidize them in St. Louis, and in Pittsburg, and in Denver, and we are now doing so in Cleveland.

The keenness of the zest of these immigrants, who have been deprived of the opportunity of learning to read and write in Russia, is indicated by the fact that we have special summer classes in New York for the immigrants who are unwilling to wait until the night schools open. In New York, with the enormous number of Jewish pupils, the night schools are open between October and April only. We had during the past year 25 classes in New York running during the hot intermediate summer months which were attended by 2,346 Jewish immigrants who were not willing to wait until October to learn English. The Educational Alliance, which we subsidize, also has about 25 special immigrant classes having 1,076 students, who are prepared for the public schools, in order to get there quicker. The course is in no event longer than two years for any of them. A number of adults also attend special adult classes.

So that almost everything conceivable is being done to Americanize the Russian and Roumanian Jewish immigrants and make them good citizens of the United States. We are acting along those lines by subsidizing different organizations throughout the United States, because we want to stimulate each locality to do the work instead of bearing the total expense ourselves. What we contribute is only a fraction of what is raised for that purpose in all the different places.

I think, therefore, that the law proposing an illiteracy test would answer absolutely no useful purpose, certainly as far as the Jewish immigrant is concerned. As soon as he comes over here he almost invariably acquires a knowledge of reading and writing, which possibly in some cases he has not got when he arrives here.

Mr. SABATH. Does not that also apply more or less to all the other nationalities—to the Poles, and to the Slavonians, and to the Bohemians, and to the Croatians?

Mr. KOHLER. My information is that it does; but my special knowledge is with respect to these Jewish organizations with which I am connected. The night-school classes in New York, of course, are enormous. Even now the College of the City of New York has opened a night college course, because of the large number thirsting for knowledge even in its higher forms. There is no danger at all that the alien immigrant coming over here will remain alien—alien to our thoughts and our citizenship.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Reference was made in the hearing to-day to the character of the examination of the immigrant on landing.

Mr. KOHLER. Yes.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. The method was greatly criticised by some of the speakers here.

Mr. KOHLER. Yes.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I understand that you have some comments to make concerning that. We shall be glad to hear you.

Mr. KOHLER. I think that branch of the law requires important administrative corrections. The Ellis Island Commission, appointed by President Roosevelt, called attention to the fact that the words of the statute specifying that the examination before the board of special inquiry shall be separate and apart from the public do not and were not intended to exclude interested friends, such as representatives of the charitable organizations that are active at Ellis Island, or counsel, or other persons of that kind. They were simply intended to prevent a multitude interfering with the transaction of business. Notwithstanding that fact, counsel is refused before the board of special inquiry in its earlier stages; and the immigrant is left entirely without an opportunity even intelligently to understand this process, this trial, involving practically his liberty. And what is more, the statute provides that on the appeal, if he takes one, the evidence shall be limited to what was adduced before the board of special inquiry. So the immigrant, without counsel and without knowledge of our laws, even on the appeal, when he is given counsel, is ridiculed in that fashion, by the requirement that even the evidence on the appeal can not be different from that before the board of special inquiry. I want to say to the credit of Mr. Williams (some of whose other actions I have had occasion to criticise) that he has, in a measure, overcome this last hardship by granting new hearings before boards of special inquiry in cases that strike him as proper; so that evidence can now be supplied in cases that he approves of.

Mr. BENNET. That was the intent of the law. Prior to the amendment information unfavorable to the immigrant was sometimes adduced before the commissioner; and it was thought to be fair that all the evidence should be before the board, and that where new evidence was attempted to be introduced the case should be sent back to the board, and the alien should have a chance to refute it.

Mr. KOHLER. Of course part of that proceeds on the theory that the law allows evidence against the immigrant to be taken outside of the board of special inquiry. The statute says that all the evidence must be reduced to writing, and it is that evidence that is to be taken up on appeal. But we know, as a matter of fact, that all sorts of extraordinary misstatements concerning the immigrant crop out in the letters of recommendation which the commissioners of the various ports make to the department, having no basis of fact in the evidence, and which, therefore, the immigrant can not meet, even when he has counsel.

Mr. BENNET. There is a great deal done that is not in the law. There is no law whatever for the letter that the commissioner invariably sends accompanying the appeal.

Mr. KOHLER. The law says his views are to be given. I think that is in the statute itself.

Mr. BENNET. No; I think you are in error about that.

Mr. KOHLER. It is in the regulation, anyhow, if not in the statute.

Mr. BENNET. That may be. There is no law for the hearing which the commissioner gives after the board of inquiry has made its decision.

Mr. KOHLER. No; that is this new method of rehearing cases before the board of special inquiry.

Mr. BENNET. The intent of the statute was that the board of special inquiry should pass on the matter, and that from its decision

there should be an appeal to the Secretary through the Commissioner-General; that if there was to be any new evidence adduced the case should be sent back to the board of special inquiry, and that the evidence should be there adduced, and on the record in each instance the appeal should be taken.

Mr. KOHLER. In the group of cases that Mr. Elkus referred to, which culminated in four habeas corpus cases (though there were 20 cases almost precisely alike that came up at the same time), a request was made for a personal hearing, because it was an important matter, before the Secretary of Commerce and Labor; or, in default thereof, for an opportunity to submit briefs. Before we knew of it, before any letter was sent in answer to our request granting either one or the other, all of these men were ordered deported, and 16 of them had, in fact, been deported before we could do anything. It is most important that the different charitable institutions represented on Ellis Island should have a right to have their representatives present freely and properly at the hearing before the board of special inquiry. We want law, and we want publicity, and we want justice, and there is no reason whatever why it should be denied. The matter was thoroughly thrashed out before the Ellis Island Commission that President Roosevelt appointed some years ago. It is a most important matter that there should be an opportunity to bring the administration of the law more in accord with the law of the land and have it a government of law and not a government of whim and caprice.

I will say that the total number of these exclusions is only from 1 to 2 per cent; but the injustice done to the individual excluded is irreparable, and no man can tell who will be visited by this miscarriage of justice. We find that about 25 per cent of the Jewish exclusions at Ellis Island—and it is undoubtedly the same with regard to the non-Jewish ones—are unjust and not warranted by this digest of immigration-law decisions published by the Government in 1899, containing the decisions of the courts as well as the rulings of the department.

Mr. BENNET. Does not the law require that an excluded alien shall be notified, if it is an appealable case, of his right to appeal?

Mr. KOHLER. It does; yes.

Mr. SABATH. But it is never done?

Mr. KOHLER. In rare cases it is not done. I have heard of cases where the entry was made after the alien had departed from the trial room. It is generally done.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Do you mean to say, Mr. Kohler, that after the alien is deported they notify somebody that there is a right of appeal?

Mr. KOHLER. No; what I refer to is this: After he has departed out of the court room, in order to comply with the regulation requiring notice to be given an entry is made on the minutes; and, naturally, one reading that assumes that the immigrant is still present in the court room. But in some cases, practically, he does not know of it. I do not think that happens very often.

Mr. BENNET. When it does happen, it is an absolute violation of the statute?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Of course.

Mr. KOHLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BENNET. There is no statute that I am aware of that prohibits him from having counsel, other than that vague language.

Mr. KOHLER. No statute at all; and that is the report of the Ellis Island Commission. But I am not so much interested in counsel and the expense of having counsel. I do want, though, to have the representatives of the charitable organizations of the different nationalities handling immigration matters at Ellis Island officially recognized by the Government, so that they may have an opportunity freely and fairly to be present, and let the light of day in upon the proceedings of the board of special inquiry in every case. That is our procedure as to all trials outside of immigration matters; and it has worked well wherever the Anglo-Saxon law prevails.

Mr. BENNET. There are 48 agents of such societies at Ellis Island, I believe.

Mr. KOHLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BENNET. You mean to say that they are excluded from the trial?

Mr. KOHLER. They are excluded. Everyone is excluded, except as a stray curiosity-seeker may happen to interest the officials in his desire to go through Ellis Island, and may thus see for a moment what is happening.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. What as to the interpreters?

Mr. KOHLER. They have interpreters of various nationalities, and I understand that they try to do their duty honestly. They are present, depending upon the language the witness speaks.

Mr. BURNETT. Are there a great many cases that go to the board of review?

Mr. KOHLER. The board of special inquiry?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. KOHLER. Yes; there are, and the number has been increasing enormously since Mr. Williams has been in office.

Mr. BURNETT. Would it not take an interminable length of time if counsel were allowed to appear? Is not that the reason, on account of the fact that they have not the time to give hearings in all these cases?

Mr. KOHLER. The counsel of these representatives are very eager to be present. The fact is that it is not deemed expedient, as I understand it, to allow anyone else in. But it is a clear misconception of the law, which President Roosevelt's Ellis Island Commission called attention to in their printed report; but the matter has not yet been remedied.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Will you give us one case in point where you know an injustice to have been done by reason of the failure of the immigrant to have counsel and to be properly advised?

Mr. KOHLER. I have here 25 cases.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Just give me one case in point—a sample case.

Mr. KOHLER. Here is a case which I have picked out—the case of Jacob Granat, 19 years of age, who came over on the steamer *Bluecher*. He was a teacher; single; his country is Galicia. He was destined to an uncle, H. Granat, living at 199 East Seventh street, New York City. He had \$32 in cash. His passage was paid by himself. Why that man should have been excluded, when this is a full and fair transcript of the case, I can not tell.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. What was the ground assigned for his exclusion?

Mr. KOHLER. He was excluded as likely to become a public charge.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. How was it possible that he would become a public charge?

Mr. KOHLER. I have stated that in every one of these 25 cases that I have picked out in the last two months, I have not any doubt that if we could have gotten them into court the court would have admitted the applicant.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. But the department surely must have assigned some reason for excluding him.

Mr. KOHLER. The ground assigned was that he was likely to become a public charge.

Mr. BURNETT. Was it not perhaps because of physical defects?

Mr. KOHLER. No; there were no physical defects in his case. In every case where there is a physical defect our records show just what it is.

Mr. SABATH. I can give you the reason that was given to me, viz, that if they deport them it will discourage immigration. That was the reason given me about these 20 Bulgarians.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. I can not conceive of that reason.

Mr. BURNETT. Who gave it to you?

Mr. SABATH. That was the reason that was given to me by an official. They had no other reason.

Mr. BENNET. Suppose you give us another case.

Mr. KOHLER. Certainly. Here is the case of Gulda Oliver. The exclusion was on the 18th day of February of this year. I ought to have stated that the other case was on the 20th of January, 1910. That is probably the date of application for admission. This Gulda Oliver, a woman 27 years of age, came over on the steamer *Marne*. She was a domestic. She was single. She came from Galicia. She was destined to a cousin, Morris Halpern, 155 Rivington street. She had \$24. Her passage was paid by herself. She was formerly in the United States for two years. And we need domestics.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. What was her age?

Mr. KOHLER. Twenty-seven.

Mr. BURNETT. What ground was assigned?

Mr. KOHLER. Likelihood to become a public charge.

Mr. BENNET. Is it not stated in connection with those cases that the reason they are likely to become a public charge is that they are going to a congested city, to wit, New York City?

Mr. KOHLER. I do not think so.

Mr. BENNET. I have seen cases of that kind.

Mr. KOHLER. It does happen on occasion; but there is no evidence as to that. It is utterly illegal. The law requires the board to decide upon the cases upon the evidence adduced before it.

Mr. BENNET. Yes.

Mr. KOHLER. And in connection with the question of domestics I would recommend an article in this month's number of "McClure's," which shows how very much we need domestics.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. There is no doubt about that, Mr. Kohler, but did you have a chance to look at that testimony at all?

Mr. KOHLER. I have not in those particular cases. I have compared these records with theirs.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. I agree with you that if the records given by you are complete there would appear to have been no reason

for sending either of those persons back. Yet there must have been something, some other reason given, than that which you assign.

Mr. KOHLER. I have seen scores of records—we had a number of them in these habeas corpus proceedings—that were just about the same.

Mr. BURNETT. Why was not habeas corpus obtained there?

Mr. KOHLER. Because Congress provided in 1891 that the decision shall be final, and reviewable only on appeal to the Secretary of Commerce and Labor.

Mr. BURNETT. But you got some others off on habeas corpus.

Mr. KOHLER. In those cases we applied to the court on the theory that because they had denied us any opportunity to argue the appeal, either personally or by brief, there was a denial even of the semblance of law. For that reason we got into court, and if the court took jurisdiction at all it would have to decide the whole matter, including the merits. But when we came near getting a judicial construction of those words in these cases, between adjournments all four of our men were admitted. Of course we could not protest against that, and our test cases disappeared.

Mr. BENNET. Would you mind if we sent to the department in these cases to get the records to see what are the exact facts?

Mr. KOHLER. I shall be very glad to have you do so.

Mr. BENNET. Suppose you take ten of them.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. I would suggest that you pick out ten cases—the ten that you regard as the most flagrant—so that we may inquire into the facts.

Mr. KOHLER. And I would also like to suggest that the letter of recommendation of the commissioner at New York should accompany them, in order to intelligently present the case.

Mr. BENNET. There would be no letter of recommendation if they were not appealed.

Mr. KOHLER. They were appealed.

Mr. BENNET. Were all of them appealed? Pick out appealed cases, then.

Mr. KOHLER. Yes; in this first case there was an appeal taken.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Under what auspices was the appeal taken?

Mr. KOHLER. The Hebrew Shelter and Aid Society, which Mr. Williams has commended as one of the two very best, if not the best, of these organizations on Ellis Island.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Then the immigrant did have the benefit of counsel to that extent?

Mr. KOHLER. After the board of special inquiry had decided the case and when he took an appeal.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. The appeal was taken under the auspices of the society, and by its advice?

Mr. KOHLER. By its advice.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. And with its assistance?

Mr. KOHLER. Exactly.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. And as the result of that appeal, the decision still was that he should be deported because he was likely to become a public charge?

Mr. KOHLER. That is right.

Mr. BURNETT. In other words, the decision of the board of inquiry was sustained by the Secretary?

Mr. KOHLER. In the group of 20 cases that Mr. McHarg, the Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Labor, handled, as I have stated, our request for a hearing, either verbally or by brief, was entirely ignored, and deportation was ordered without even giving us a chance to be heard.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Then the society, as the friend of the immigrant thus rejected, was not given an opportunity to ascertain any further facts as to the cause of deportation except what you have stated?

Mr. KOHLER. When an appeal is taken the testimony is subject to inspection by counsel, but the private recommendations of the commissioner are not; and those are sometimes very suggestive, as we have found out.

Mr. BURNETT. Were you heard before the Secretary of Commerce and Labor?

Mr. KOHLER. In this first case, at least, the record was transmitted to the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, and a formal order dismissing the appeal and ordering deportation was made.

Mr. BURNETT. Was a brief filed by you or anyone else before the Secretary of Commerce and Labor?

Mr. KOHLER. A record and a brief were submitted; yes.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Was that based on the testimony taken by the board of inquiry?

Mr. KOHLER. I understand that the Secretary considered the words "a person likely to become a public charge" to cover the case of a person who is poor, or likely to be poor, or whom they guess may possibly become poor, and that that accounts for the deportation.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Then the testimony was available to counsel for the society?

Mr. KOHLER. When the appeal was taken, after the board of special inquiry had decided the case.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Then how could you know whether there was anything further in the testimony than what you have just indicated to justify a ruling of deportation?

Mr. KOHLER. I know clearly from the report that there was nothing further, because I have found all of these reports to be faithfully and fully made out, the very purpose being to present all the facts. I have a group here of about 75 more cases where I think the deportation was probably justified on the legal theories that obtain. I am only picking out, as I said, perhaps 25 per cent of these.

Mr. BURNETT. Were you the attorney for the appellant?

Mr. KOHLER. No; I simply acted in an advisory capacity.

Mr. BURNETT. You did not file a brief, then?

Mr. KOHLER. No; but our representative at Ellis Island did.

STATEMENT OF MR. HARRY CUTLER, OF PROVIDENCE, R. I.

Mr. CUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I came all the way from Providence hoping to present some evidence before the committee. I see that the hour is late, and that it is impossible to light up the room, and that probably a few of the members of the committee (perhaps all of them) have other engagements, so that for various reasons the hearing must of necessity cease to-day. I should be very glad, however, if I could be given an opportunity to be heard to-morrow. You have already promised to hear one gentleman then. I should be glad to stay

over and take advantage of that opportunity to speak before the committee.

Mr. BENNET. This part of the hearings is under the charge of Judge Goldfogle. I have no doubt he will be very glad to do that.

Mr. CUTLER. I should like to know if that will be agreeable.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. To-morrow I shall not be here. I expect to leave to-night.

Mr. CUTLER. I have just been reminded by Doctor Friedman that, aside from other qualifications, I am a member of the executive committee of the American-Jewish committee and of this special committee that was requested to come here to-day.

Mr. SABATH. Why can not Mr. Cutler be heard to-morrow?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I can not be here to-morrow.

Mr. CUTLER. I shall not occupy more than ten minutes now, if it is your desire that I shall go on now.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. We will hear you on Monday.

Mr. CUTLER. On Monday I can not be here. I should return to-day. I had an appointment with Senator Aldrich which I have missed, and there are some matters that make it necessary for me to go back. In fact, I was obliged to leave a very busy session of the legislature of Rhode Island, at which there was a public hearing in which I am very much interested.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. If you have remarks prepared, in view of the situation as you have already stated it, you may submit those remarks, and the committee will pass on them and probably will permit them to be placed in the hearings.

Mr. CUTLER. I have not any remarks prepared. I have some figures which I should like to submit.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Just submit the figures to me, and I will present them to the committee.

Mr. CUTLER. I would not take more than ten minutes.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Have you figures besides those presented by the gentlemen who represent the same organization that you represent?

Mr. CUTLER. Yes, sir; they are absolutely different.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Do you mean that they differ from those figures?

Mr. CUTLER. No; I do not. I mean they are with regard to data that has not yet been submitted.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. If you will send the data it will be presented to the committee; no doubt the committee, upon my request, will allow it to be printed.

Mr. CUTLER. There is no way that I can be heard to-morrow, then?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Not very well. There is work before the committee to-morrow. I shall not be able to attend the session. I want to attend these meetings of the committee. I have attended pretty much every one of them so far, and I desire to attend all to the close.

Mr. CUTLER. Well, Mr. Chairman, if I may detain you but a second, I want to say that it is very, very unfortunate, to say the least, that it is impossible for me to have a few minutes' talk to-day. I represent a constituency that perhaps ought to be heard from through their representative.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Why do you not proceed now?

Mr. CUTLER. If you are willing, I will.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Notwithstanding the extreme lateness of the hour, you may proceed for five minutes.

Mr. CUTLER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, at the outset I want to express my personal thanks and my deep gratitude because, under all the conditions that have already been stated, you have allowed me a few moments at this time.

As I said at the beginning, I represent a part of the committee of the American Jewish committee. I am also president of the Independent Order of B'nai Brith, District No. 1, which includes New York and Brooklyn, the New England States, and eastern Canada. The committee desired that I present myself here to-day in the light of perhaps what might be termed a horrible example, or, as one of the gentlemen kindly stated, a good exhibit of what an immigrant can evolve into if given an opportunity.

I also am of Russian birth, and came here after the massacres of 1882, having experienced in the city of my birth the very massacres that have been spoken of.

Mr. BENNET. Which was what city?

Mr. CUTLER. Elizabethgrad. It is not necessary for me to go in detail into the horrors of those days. You gentlemen are acquainted perhaps as well as anyone can be with what those persecutions and massacres (or "pogroms," as they are called), mean. It is only fair to say that through the friendship of our Gentile neighbors, as we term them there, or "Goim" (Christians), our house was saved by reason of the fact that in every one of the windows and doors there was suspended or exhibited either a Madonna, or a crucifix, or something symbolic of the Greek Catholic Church in order to mislead the rabble. From the night that my father went to defend his store I have never seen him. That led, of course, to the emigration to this country of my mother, my sister, and myself.

I do not say these things, gentlemen, for self-exploitation or egotism, but in order to convey a point which the committee asked me to make.

Coming to this country during the days of Castle Garden (not Ellis Island), we also experienced the congested condition of those days through being obliged to be removed to some island, which to-day I term Blackwell's Island, or some near-by island. That was necessary because of the fact that there was not room enough in the city of New York or in Castle Garden to take care of the congested immigration before it was transmitted to other portions of the country.

It is unnecessary for me to go through my experience in this country. It was the experience of thousands of other immigrants. There was no opportunity for schooling, such as we had hoped I would have. I was only able to secure such schooling as I could pick up in a general way.

Mr. BURNETT. You could read when you came?

Mr. CUTLER. I could read Yiddish and Russian, and translate Hebrew.

Mr. BENNET. And how old were you?

Mr. CUTLER. I was then 9 years of age. The Hebrew, of course, is distinctly different from the Yiddish. I think the committee understands that. The Yiddish which has been so much referred to to-day is not a language; it is a jargon. It is a great borrower from other languages. The Yiddish in Germany borrows from the German language; the Yiddish in Russia borrows from the Russian language; and the Yiddish in America borrows from the English language.

That is because it is not, properly speaking, a language at all; it is a jargon; it has no grammar, but depends on these interpolations to carry out a sentence.

Mr. BURNETT. Could most of your co-religionists of the same age read?

Mr. CUTLER. Most of them could—that is, most of those that came with us.

Mr. BURNETT. I mean those in the locality from which you came.

Mr. CUTLER. No; I would not say they could all read Yiddish. Most of them, or a majority of them, probably could read Hebrew, because Hebrew is a language of the Bible, and that is first taught.

Mr. BENNET. But I infer, from the fact that your father had a store, that you belonged to the better-to-do classes?

Mr. CUTLER. If I may be permitted to say so modestly, my folks trace their lineage back to Catherine the First and Peter the Great. My father was in business, in partnership with a Gentile. They had three stores—one, if I recall correctly, in St. Petersburg, another in Warsaw, and another in Elizabethgrad.

The evolution of the individual you see before you has been such that I have taken advantage of the opportunities this grand Government has extended to me and to every immigrant that has come here. And I feel, gentlemen, that the same opportunities that I have had should be presented to those who are now knocking at the door and seeking this harbor of refuge. I characterize myself, not, as these gentlemen have said, as a “good exhibit,” but I characterize myself as an American citizen of Russian nativity and Jewish faith. Through fortuitous circumstances I now fill a certain position in the community in which I reside. Politically, I am a member of the Rhode Island legislature. The military position I hold is that of captain of my company in the First Light Infantry Regiment. I also have the distinction, I believe, of being the only man of my faith who is a codirector in the educational department of the Y. M. C. A. So I have tried to take part in both Jewish and Gentile endeavors, and I can attest the correctness of almost everything these gentlemen have said with regard to the carrying out of our efforts to inculcate, along settlement and educational and communal lines, the development of the new immigrant.

But the figures I want to submit to you furnish a better and more concrete example than I could ever offer as a reason why the Hayes bill, or any similar bill, should not be enacted into law, and why immigration should be allowed to proceed. This country is not in any sense thickly populated. As showing that, I want to submit to you certain figures compiled by the commissioner of industrial statistics, from which yesterday I hurriedly collated certain references; and I shall be glad to leave you his report, which we think is admirable.

Mr. BURNETT. You refer to the commissioner of industrial statistics of your State?

Mr. CUTLER. Of our State. In considering these figures as applicable to Rhode Island, gentlemen, we must take into consideration the fact that Rhode Island, the greatest State in the Union, although the smallest in territory (gentlemen from other States will pardon me), and a State that ought to be represented on this committee, I think—Rhode Island, small in territory but great in its varied industries, which are of so vast a character, is considered in a sense to

be a densely populated State. I think most of you gentlemen will agree that that is the general acceptation. I have taken from a classification of twenty-four distinct industries in Rhode Island (because I did not have the time to collate more) the statistics relating to about eleven important wage-earning industries. I have done this to show you what the immigrants in that State have done for the development of the State—immigrants who, as has been said, came over in the steerage from the time of the *Mayflower* to that of the *Mauretania*.

Mr. BENNET. If you will leave the paper, you can put it in without reading it.

Mr. CUTLER. It will only take me a moment, Mr. Chairman, and then I will conclude:

Agricultural pursuits: American-born, 58.66 per cent; foreign-born, 41.34 per cent.
Workers on apparel: American-born, 24.96 per cent; foreign-born, 75.04 per cent.
Building trades: American-born, 36.32 per cent; foreign-born, 63.68 per cent.
Government employees—

And this is something to be remembered, gentlemen—

American-born, 46.82 per cent; foreign-born, 53.18 per cent.

Mr. BURNETT. Are the foreign-born persons both of whose parents were born abroad?

Mr. CUTLER. No; as I understand it, that includes two generations. Some of them may have come here themselves or their parents have come here.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. You have a very large French-Canadian population there, too, have you not?

Mr. CUTLER. Not a very large French-Canadian population. We have a considerable number of French-Canadians. Massachusetts, the adjacent State, has a large French-Canadian population around Lowell and Fall River and those places. So that we have 53.18 per cent of foreign-born government employees, as against 46.82 per cent American-born.

Jewelry, gold and silver: American-born, 35.43 per cent; foreign-born, 64.57 per cent.

Manufacturers of baser metals: American-born, 26.96 per cent; foreign-born, 73.04 per cent.

Manufacturers of miscellaneous articles: American-born, 39.56 per cent; foreign-born, 60.44 per cent.

Manufacturers of textiles: American-born, 15.84 per cent; foreign-born, 84.16 per cent.

Retail merchants, dealers, etc.: American-born, 44.71 per cent; foreign-born, 55.29 per cent.

And if the chairman of the committee will permit me, I should like to complete this list of percentages and mail it to you immediately upon my return to Providence.

Mr. BENNET. Surely.

Mr. CUTLER. Now, gentlemen, so much has been said with regard to the economic side of this matter, and so much has been said with regard to the sympathetic and the humanitarian side of it, that it is utterly unnecessary for me to touch upon those things. But in the interest of the development of this country, which needs the immigrant, the men I represent and the men who have sent me here protest against any obnoxious measures of this kind as being utterly bad.

I thank you.

(The committee thereupon adjourned.)

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Saturday, March 12, 1910.

The committee met at 11 o'clock a. m., Hon. William S. Bennet, presiding. Others present were Representatives Moore, of Texas, Burnett, Küstermann, Sabath, and Hayes.

Mr. BENNET. We will hear Mr. Keliher, who has been waiting on the committee two or three days.

**STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN A. KELIHER, A REPRESENTATIVE
FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS.**

Mr. KELIHER. In my opinion there is no general demand in the country for legislation embodying the propositions contained in the bills now under consideration, which provide an increased head tax educational test, and for money in the pocket. The demand is an artificial one. It has been largely created by a propaganda which I believe has been in existence since the birth of the Republic. From it has perennially come a demand to Congress for an increase in the barriers to immigration, first in one form, then in another. It has been directed against the Irish, German, and Scandinavian, and now aims to strike the Italian and Jew.

It would seem that, in view of the consideration given the law recommended a few years ago by this committee and passed by Congress, it would be good judgment to allow that law at least to remain in its original form until a much fairer test of its efficacy be had before giving heed to the present objections of the restrictionists.

This Hayes bill, to my mind, while introduced apparently with the object of increasing restriction, is really the bill of a man who believes and desires exclusion absolutely. I have more respect for the bold exclusionist, who declares that the time has come when we have got to erect barriers that will keep out almost all foreigners, than I have for the man who attempts to attain, by indirection, that same exclusion. There are marching to-day, throughout the country, under the banner of restriction, a great number of people who believe absolutely in exclusion. It is true that there is a goodly number of people in this country to-day who are apprehensive, along economic lines, that unless something is done in the way of curbing immigration grave danger will ensue economically to the country, but in the main this opposition has been aroused, organized, and is exploited by this particular propaganda which I have mentioned.

Mr. BURNETT. To what propaganda do you refer?

Mr. KELIHER. I can not give you its exact title.

Mr. BURNETT. You mean the Junior Order of United Mechanics?

Mr. KELIHER. Yes; the Junior Order of United American Mechanics, I think.

Mr. BURNETT. You are aware of the fact that farmers' unions, composed of 3,000,000 farmers, have asked for it and have also favored it by their resolutions?

Mr. KELIHER. I am also aware of the fact that until this order got to propagating among the farmers of the country that we heard very little from the farmers. I also recall reading memorials and petitions to Congress in which the farmers declare that these immigrants stay in the big cities, huddle together there, and become a menace to the country. Surely if that is true the farmers do not come much in contact with the immigrants, have little opportunity to study them, and then there can be no great danger to the farmers from city aliens.

Mr. BURNETT. You think the American Federation of Labor was influenced by that same spirit?

Mr. KELIHER. I think the American Federation of Labor is not wholly influenced by the same spirit.

Mr. BURNETT. You are aware of the fact that they have passed resolutions at several annual meetings?

Mr. KELIHER. I am perfectly well aware of that, but I know that the rank and file of the labor unions of the country are opposed to this sort of legislation.

Mr. BURNETT. How could they have resolutions adopted, then, as they have had them adopted?

Mr. KELIHER. Your experience and mine teaches us that in great organizations and in great conventions many resolutions are passed that have not been given the consideration they deserve and with the purport of which a great number of the members of the convention are not familiar.

Mr. BENNET. How could they go on doing this for three or four successive annual meetings, as they have, if they did not know what the membership wanted?

Mr. KELIHER. I am still of this opinion, that the question of closing the doors to desirable immigration, which will unquestionably follow to a large extent if you adopt this educational test, the increased head tax, and the money in pocket provision, has not been given thorough and serious consideration by those bodies.

Mr. BURNETT. Don't you think the educational test has?

Mr. KELIHER. Not the consideration it is entitled to.

Mr. MOORE. We had one of their representatives here a few days ago, Mr. Roe, and he presented some resolutions and made quite a lengthy statement.

Mr. BURNETT. Time and time again we have had such resolutions presented.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. The great bulk of workingmen do not agree with him, I am thoroughly convinced.

Mr. KELIHER. Now, in very hastily going over the provisions of the pending Hayes bill, I find that which stands out conspicuously is the increased head tax, and, as I said before, the educational test. Now, I do not believe any good American citizen thinks that a man who has money in his pocket is a better man than one who has not, particularly if the man judged comes from a section of the world where the opportunity to honestly earn money is limited, very limited, and I think the theory that a man with money is a better man than one without is repugnant to the American idea and spirit. Now, I can not see, for myself, what improvement an alien will be in this country who has a knowledge of Yiddish, or a foreign language, over one who has not such a knowledge. I would much rather see immigrants come into our country who could not read and write Yiddish,

because their offspring would be more inclined and more apt to take up English and learn English than if the parents had a knowledge of Yiddish and taught the offspring that tongue.

Mr. BURNETT. You think it better to have illiterates than those who have education?

Mr. KELIHER. I think the crux of this whole question at present is its economic feature and no other. It has been said so frequently, that it is almost plagiarism to quote it, that we have a superabundance of brain and a dearth of brawn in this country, and I hope this committee will give due consideration to the economic phase of this proposition. I do not understand the conditions in the South and you do not our conditions in the North. I believe if this bill were to pass, and if we were to exclude healthy immigrants that were not capable of reading the language of their mother countries there would be such a dearth of that class of labor that we in the North need that it would practically paralyze many of the great projects now in process of construction in our country. You can not get the son of the first generation of the Italian to go down into our tunnels, where the labor is extremely arduous and hazardous. Why, in Boston we have just completed building a tunnel under the bed of our harbor, where the work was very hazardous as well as trying upon the laborers. You can not get American labor; you can not get the German, the Irishman, or the American to do that work, and I will make this prediction: If this bill were to become law it would not be upon the statute books two years before there would be a demand for legislation to repeal it or resolutions calling for a suspension of it in order to meet paralyzed conditions of business in our industrial centers, as a result of a shortage of labor that present-day immigration is furnishing in response to a constant demand.

Mr. BURNETT. If they would pay them enough they could get all the labor needed?

Mr. KELIHER. You could not get an Irishman to go down into those tunnels and do the work these willing Italians do for \$10 a day.

Mr. BURNETT. Didn't they do it before these men got to coming here?

Mr. KELIHER. Yes, sir; when the conditions of the country were different, and in twenty-five years from now I do not know where you are going to recruit your rough, crude, labor if the present supply is exhausted, because you are not going to get the second generation of immigrants to engage in it.

Returning to what has been said about the apprehension that our country will go to the bow-wows unless great barriers, insurmountable barriers, are created to keep out immigration, Mr. Hayes, at a recent meeting, said he believed the scum of Europe was being diverted in this direction. This seems to be an arraignment of the administration of existing laws, because we have laws upon our statute books which provide the most rigid examination of immigrants, and if that element to which Mr. Hayes refers is getting in it must be due to the lax enforcement of existing laws; and if it were true that laws now on the statute books were not being enforced is there any reason to believe that if you put additional laws on they would be enforced?

Mr. BENNET. A gentleman who appeared before our committee yesterday said the law was being overenforced.

Mr. KELIHER. From my experience in Boston, representing in part the second largest port of entry, representing, also, a constituency that is quite cosmopolitan, which brings me frequently in contact with the immigration officials, I unhesitatingly state that the law there is rigidly enforced, and I know where I have made appeals to and from decisions of these officials in many cases I have been rarely successful. I have carried innumerable cases to Washington and frequently have had the decision of the local immigration commissioner set aside by the authorities down here.

Mr. BENNET. And you have had the same local commissioner under Secretaries Metcalf, Straus, and——

Mr. KELIHER. Colonel Billings has been immigration commissioner there since President McKinley's time; yes. He was there under the secretaries you mention.

Mr. BENNET. And the enforcement of the law has been uniform during all of that time?

Mr. KELIHER. Absolutely. Now, we have always heard a great deal about what is going to happen if these immigrants continue to come in. I am too practical, and I know the committee is too, to spend much time in showing that apprehension similar to that expressed to-day was voiced one hundred years ago, and has been throughout the life of the Republic. One hundred and odd years ago a very distinguished citizen and statesman of my State, a man of renown for wisdom in his time, Harrison Gray Otis, said, in debating a bill which aimed to increase the cost of naturalization to an alien to a price that would practically render citizenship impossible of attainment, "That while it was good policy to have admitted all immigrants when the country was new, it was no longer a new country and a bar should be placed against the admittance of these restless people who can not be happy and tranquil at home." The country was quite a new country when Mr. Otis spoke, because he spoke in 1797. Later on he said: "We do not want a vast horde of wild Irishmen let loose upon us."

This declaration was made upon the floor of Congress in 1797. How much did the fear expressed by Otis then differ from what we hear to-day from these restrictionists? I know you were deluged, submerged with figures and statistics yesterday, and so I will not encumber the record any more to show how untenable is the position of those who argue along these lines. You know about what the population was at that time; suffice to state that our country contained 827,844 square miles and a population which averaged less than 5 people to a square mile.

Mr. BURNETT. Is that a copy of the Congressional Record in 1797 from which you are reading?

Mr. KELIHER. I am quoting from a speech delivered by me some four years ago. I think I took this data from one of the histories of the United States. I was at that time speaking upon the opposition to immigration at that time, 1797.

Mr. SABATH. So this is not a new question?

Mr. KELIHER. No; this is a perennial question. John Randolph, in a speech delivered in Congress when we had but 11,000 immigrants in a year, declared: "You must teach the people of Europe if they do come here, all they must hope to receive is protection. But they must have no share in the Government." So these apprehensions as

to what is going to happen to our country are not new. Note the apprehension of the mayor of New York over seventy years ago:

Aaron Clark, mayor of New York City in 1837 when the number of immigrants arriving yearly were but 57,936, in a communication to the city council of that city, dated June 5, painted the following gloomy picture of the menacing effect immigration was having upon the country in general and the metropolis in particular:

"Our streets are filled with wandering crowds of these passengers clustering in our city, unacquainted with our climate, without employment, without friends, not speaking our language, and without any dependence for food, or raiment, or fireside, certain of nothing but hardship and a grave; and to be viewed, of course, with no very ardent sympathy by those native citizens whose immediate ancestors were the saviors of the country in its greatest peril. Besides, many of them scorn to hold opinions in harmony with the true spirit of our Government. They drive our native workmen into exile."

Henry Clay, illustrious as a statesman and preeminent among the thinkers of his time, displayed inexplicably weak judgment in treating this question. In 1830 he declared in the Senate "that it had not become a permanent policy of the country to go on inviting all the hordes of Europe to come over and partake of this bounty (public lands) derived from our ancestors, and which we should preserve for our posterity." The hordes Clay had in mind were the Germans, Irish, and Scandinavians. Do you hear much harder terms applied to the Italian and Jew immigrant to-day?

There are a number of cases that I might quote to show that in those early days there was much the same kind of alarm in this connection. However, I am satisfied that if you were to poll intelligently the sentiment of the business world throughout the United States to-day an overwhelming verdict against this proposition would be obtained. I have talked with men in the business world in my section, men who are the heads of large commercial enterprises, men who are at the head of mills, and the universal opinion has been that legislation like this would be a mistake. They all believe that the moral and physical qualification of the incoming man be judged by a very high standard, but so far as closing the doors to honest immigrants who are ready to work they are universally, as I have said, opposed to it.

In your particular country, Mr. Burnett, there is a strong local opposition to the Italian coming into it, and I think that is based upon the theory that the Italian would be a menace to that section. I think the satisfaction expressed for the negro help in the South is due to the fact that the negro in the main is devoid of ambition, while the Italian is chock full of it; I think you feel down there that if the Italian got into the cotton fields in a short while he would become the possessor of cotton seed, would grow cotton, and become a competitor, while the negro shows no such aptitude.

MR. BURNETT. We have had quite a number of your south Italians, but they do not stay in the cotton fields.

MR. BENNET. Here is what the immigration movement is doing. I do not speak so much of Alabama; but you take Mr. Burnett's particular district; it is a good deal like a great many more or less mountainous districts in the North; it is not essentially a cotton growing district at all, but it has a tremendous industrial future.

MR. KELIHER. I did not speak particularly as to his district; I was speaking of the South generally.

MR. BENNET. Here is one relation of the immigrant to the South. I took a trip through the South with Mr. Burnett, on the subject of

peonage. Men are moving down to Florida, particularly from the Middle West, and taking up land, buying land, a few acres or more acres, and going into industries, thereby increasing the white population, and their places in the Middle West are being taken by people who go from my State, and their places in my State are being taken by the second generation of the foreigners. It is a cycle. We investigated a case down there where a man was tried and his lawyer tried to show that he hadn't had a fair trial because the majority of the jurors had been born outside of the State of Florida, and then——

Mr. BURNETT. There was good evidence that that was not a fact?

Mr. BENNET. Well, that question was raised.

Mr. BURNETT. So far as the south Italians coming into competition with our cotton raisers, that is not a fact, because they do not raise cotton. We have thousands of them in the Birmingham district, as it is called there, and they are all going in the coal mines and iron manufacturing plants. Now, as to the Bohemians and Germans, they go into farming and make money as farmers. I will state that my colleague, Mr. Moore, has a great many Bohemians in his district, and he tells me they are as good farmers and as good citizens as there are there, and the same is true as to the Germans.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Then, the Italians are not in your mines?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes; they say the negro is a better workman than the Italian, but they hire the Italian to keep down expenses.

Mr. HAYES. The Italian is not a miner.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Then come to our country and see.

Mr. HAYES. I have employed them by the hundreds and know what I am talking about.

Mr. KELIHER. A statement was made before the committee yesterday that the negro, for hard work, was a better laborer than the Italian. I had occasion almost daily, when I was living near the site of the present new Metropolitan Club, to pass while the excavating work was in progress. I saw the work of excavation being done by negro help; the builder was a very prominent builder in the country, and I was struck by the length of time it took to excavate that particular corner; the soil was not hard; there was no blasting to be done; and in talking with a large contractor, who was here in Washington at that time, I made that observation; he said that with his help, which was largely Italian, he could excavate that place in, I think he said, one-third shorter time. In the North, where we are fairly familiar with this sort of thing, the Italian is considered the best man for rough, heavy labor.

Mr. BURNETT. You mean the south Italians?

Mr. KELIHER. The south Italians. Now, I can speak with some degree of intelligence about the second generation of these foreigners. I was born in a section that was populated by them early, so that I have a very good idea. The first generation of the Jew, the Russian Jew, the Polish Jew, the Italian, the German, and the Irish—I am the son of an Irishman who came here in 1848, and I want to say——

Mr. BENNET. And probably if they had had this particular restrictive measure your father might have been barred out.

Mr. KELIHER. My father, fortunately, could have entered, for he had fortunately succeeded in getting an education.

Mr. HAYES. Not many Irishmen were barred out.

Mr. KELIHER. I doubt whether he could have entered if the money-in-the-pocket test was applied in his day, because he left a land, as you all know, that was a land of starvation, and he chose to come to this country rather than face that condition.

Mr. BURNETT. The south Italians have not been coming here long enough to furnish a large number of the second generation.

Mr. KELIHER. We have a goodly number of the second generation of the south Italian in my city, and they are doing very well. As I started to say that ample opportunity has been afforded me to observe the advancement of these immigrants. What they lacked they give their children and in these you note great progress. They have gone into our schools, these children of the first generation.

Mr. BURNETT. Born in America?

Mr. KELIHER. Born in America; but some of whose parents had not been here long enough either to become naturalized or to become educated, because they toiled from early morning until late at night. These children of immigrant parents, Jews and Italian, are taking prizes at an amazing rate in our schools; they are considered among our best scholars; the avidity with which they seek education up our way—and I do not think our is any different than throughout the rest of the country—is remarkable; they attend our night schools; they are becoming stenographers; the daughters are going into the employment of the telephone companies, the sons into mercantile houses. They are doing splendidly, and they give most encouraging promise so far as citizenship is concerned.

Mr. BENNET. Speaking of schools, I might say that in the last census the figures show that the children of the Italians went to school at an earlier age, stayed more days in the week, more weeks in the month, and more months in the year, and more years in school life than the children of the native born.

Mr. HAYES. Who says that?

Mr. BENNET. The census, 1900.

Mr. BURNETT. There were but few of them here then.

Mr. BENNET. Oh, yes, there were.

Mr. HAYES. I want to say that in what I said about the Italian not being a good miner I do not wish to be understood as saying he is not a good worker, but he does not seem to be able to catch on with the mining work; he is not a natural miner.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Our mines are filled with them.

Mr. HAYES. Whereabouts?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Up in northern Michigan and in my State.

Mr. HAYES. I have mined up there and there are very few of them where I mined.

Mr. KELIHER. This provision in Mr. Hayes's bill to the effect that "an admissible alien over 16 years of age, or a person now or hereafter in the United States of like age, may bring in or send for his wife, his mother, his affianced wife, or his father who is over 55 years of age, if they are otherwise admissible, whether they are able to read or not," does not seem to me to be a very practical one; if put in operation it would have a tendency to increase deception, and the number of affianced wives, I think, of resident aliens, would increase at such an alarming pace that it would be necessary to soon legislate against that proposition.

Mr. HAYES. Have you visited Ellis Island and observed the regulations in regard to that very thing?

Mr. KELIHER. I can not say that I am thoroughly familiar with them.

Mr. HAYES. They do not permit anything of that kind; the young man must come there or they must be thoroughly satisfied from where he lives that his intentions are good; that sort of thing is all looked after.

Mr. KELIHER. I am afraid you will increase bigamy.

Mr. BENNETT. And yet with those regulations—which I agree with Mr. Hayes are very strict—the Commissioner-General says that the law is being violated in that regard, and asks us to pass a law reversing the practice of all time and provide that a foreign-born woman who marries a citizen must affirmatively prove that she is a person of good moral character after the marriage in order to be considered a citizen, because he says some are evading the law.

Mr. SABATH. How long has the Commissioner of Immigration been in office?

Mr. BENNETT. The Commissioner-General?

Mr. HAYES. About one year.

Mr. BENNETT. No; longer than that.

Mr. BURNETT. You mean at Ellis Island?

Mr. BENNETT. About two years.

Mr. SABATH. I mean the one who makes these recommendations?

Mr. BURNETT. You mean Keefe?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; how long has he been in office?

Mr. BENNETT. A year and a half, anyway.

Mr. HAYES. Since the election, anyway.

Mr. BENNETT. My recollection is that he was appointed just prior to the election.

Mr. SABATH. No; he was appointed after the election, because during the election he was busy electioneering.

Mr. BURNETT. He didn't get busy until after the election.

Mr. SABATH. The reason for that remark is that he makes so many recommendations, and I hardly believe a man who has been in office a year, and has so many other things and duties to perform, would be in a position to know what really is demanded, required, and needed.

Mr. KELIHER. Now, as to this provision for a certificate of character that the immigrant is of good moral character, "signed by and under the seal of the proper official whose duty it is to keep such record in the community from which they come," it occurs to me that in many sections where people are, because of conditions, forced to leave, it is barely possible that a stubborn official might refuse a certificate of character, not because the applicant was not qualified by moral character and so forth to receive one, but because of perverseness, prejudice, or whatever might sway an official unfriendly or unsympathetic; then what is going to happen to the immigrant who wants to come to this country? To whom can he appeal to right the palpable wrong which has been done him? I find no provision here for cases of that sort which, in my opinion, would be numerous if this bill became a law. I understood you to say, Mr. Hayes, and I think I caught you right, that there was a tendency on the part of those European

authorities to dump these people over here. If that were true there would be——

Mr. HAYES. If they are undesirable, yes.

Mr. KELIHER. There would be liable to be a wholesale presentation of certificates by people from communities desirous of being rid of them, and this would fall flat as a consequence.

Mr. HAYES. We have got most of them already.

Mr. KELIHER. In that you and I differ.

Mr. BURNETT. You think that the officials of these countries would be so corrupt as to make false affidavits for that purpose?

Mr. KELIHER. I believe it is possible; if it is true that the desire is so great to be rid of these people, I do not see that anything would stand in the path of carrying out their designs.

Mr. BENNET. We had to stop the giving of Chinese certificates in China because there was a well-grounded suspicion that our American officials were getting rich.

Mr. HAYES. They were being bribed?

Mr. BENNET. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. If that kind of corruption exists among the officials, would it be safe to have people coming from the countries where officials are so corrupt?

Mr. KELIHER. You hear it and I hear it, from certain men who have intense feelings and little knowledge on this subject, and, I think, are blind in their judgment, that some of our officials, who administer the immigration laws—while they do not say they are “corrupt,” they use a term which dangerously approaches it.

Mr. BURNETT. But you have repudiated that idea by saying they are efficiently administering the laws.

Mr. KELIHER. The point I make is that our officials are not corrupt, but that certain people still believe them corrupt, having no right to do so.

Mr. BURNETT. It is not what the people believe, but do you think they would be corrupt, as a matter of fact?

Mr. KELIHER. I have no doubt—I, of course, can not base it upon any definite knowledge—but I have no doubt that these certificates could be obtained by those not entitled to them; yes.

Mr. BURNETT. I think that is an unfortunate admission to be made by a man who wants to admit people from such countries.

Mr. KELIHER. But we do not admit them upon the say of foreign officials, corrupt or honest; we admit them upon their character, physical and moral, based upon standards fixed by our officials, and applied when they reach here.

Mr. BURNETT. If their officials are as corrupt as that——

Mr. KELIHER. I am not speaking of general corruption; I am speaking of sporadic corruption.

Mr. SABATH. We have enough of it here in this country.

Mr. HAYES. Then you ought not to import any.

Mr. SABATH. We are not importing the officials here, not importing their corrupt officials, nor do we desire them, but it is the people, and as a rule you can trust the people, in whose behalf Mr. Keliher is speaking, not the officials that are corrupt; you do not want to permit them to come.

Mr. BURNETT. I understand that is a rather wholesale charge against officials, that wherever they wanted to dump them on us the officials themselves——

Mr. KELIHER. Perhaps I didn't quite understand you, and perhaps you didn't quite understand me, and I must correct myself. I did not say I believed there would be a wholesale issuance of fraudulent certificates, but I think the possibility of fraudulent certificates being issued is great.

Mr. BENNET. In other words, the same condition would come to exist there as has existed in our country, which led us to amend the naturalization laws?

Mr. KELIHER. Absolutely.

Mr. BURNETT. That was not the corruption of the officials so much, as I understand it, as it was the false affidavits of those seeking naturalization.

Mr. BENNET. You do not suppose a man would naturalize 2,500 in one day in my city without something doing?

Mr. BURNETT. Well, New York is something of an exception.

Mr. KELIHER. I am still firmly of the opinion—and I do not pretend to have been a deep student of this question—that the character of an immigrant coming into this country should be decided on this side of the water and not on the other side.

Now, in section 6 you add another section by which you propose a change in existing law, "That in addition to the aliens now excluded by law the following shall also be, and hereby are, excluded from admission into the United States, to wit: All girls under 20 years of age, unaccompanied by one or both of their parents, at the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor or under such regulations as he may from time to time prescribe." I think that would be very undesirable.

Mr. HAYES. The law that has been passed since this bill was introduced, regulating the white-slave traffic, of course removes the necessity of such legislation in this bill.

Mr. KELIHER. I do know this, that there are numerous Swedish, Irish, German, and European girls who come over here, unaccompanied by parents, to become domestics, and, as you know, the material in line here to-day is very limited.

Mr. HAYES. Of course the Secretary of Commerce and Labor would not exclude them?

Mr. KELIHER. Unless you got a Secretary of Commerce and Labor who believed that all people coming here were a menace to the country.

Mr. HAYES. That is not worth discussing, because we have passed a bill that covers that ground.

Mr. KELIHER. Now, your provision for a certificate of residence of unnaturalized residents I think is rather drastic. I think there are many people in the United States who are still aliens (aliens not by choice, but because of inability to meet the requirements of the naturalization courts) who are pretty good residents, and I think the process of practically branding them and treating them as suspects is——

Mr. HAYES. That is not justified.

Mr. KELIHER. You propose to take a man, even if he has been in this country twenty years, who happens to be not naturalized

because he can not, to the bureau of naturalization and say: "This is John Murphy; he came from Ireland twenty years ago; he is not a citizen, and I want you to give him a certificate of residence." I think that would work a hardship. Of course I think the element you desire to reach is a different element altogether, but the fact remains, nevertheless, that this man I have described comes under that provision, which I consider altogether too drastic, and too like methods in vogue in certain European countries. It is un-American, in my opinion.

I do not know that I have anything further to add except to state that I speak here not alone as the representative of a constituency that is made up of numerous newly made American citizens, but I speak for large industrial and commercial interests in my community that have given considerable thought and study to this subject and are firmly convinced that business would suffer if such a provision as the educational test were applied as a prerequisite of admission of immigrants coming to this country. I wish also to record my dissent from certain views expressed here that Jewish and Italian immigration constitutes a present or a likely menace to our institutions. We in the North have received and assimilated them and the prevailing opinion of unprejudiced students of the immigration question is to let it alone aside from enforcing the present adequate laws upon the subject.

Mr. BENNET. Representative Harrison, of New York, desires to address the committee.

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANCIS BURTON HARRISON, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I beg your indulgence to address myself for a few moments only to one particular phase of the Hayes bill. I refer to the clause requiring an educational test for immigrants. I appear here as the representative of an east-side district in New York, which is composed of the men of many nations.

Mr. BENNET. An uptown east-side district?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes, sir. I apologize for a personal reference, but I also appear as the scion of an American stock which, on both sides of my family, has been in the United States since the colony of Virginia was first discovered. I therefore venture to hope that in discussing this subject I speak for a certain part, at least, of the oldest American stock. I am unalterably opposed to an educational test for the admission of immigrants. I fail to see in what respect a man who is able to read differs from a man who is unable to read, so far as his ability to work or even his future ability to become a citizen is concerned. The illiterates who have come into the east side of New York have shown, in their children, and even in the older people themselves, an ardent desire to educate themselves which is unsurpassed among the people of native stock.

Judging from those of the second generation, whom I know and whom I have seen in my district, I believe that they have helped to form the prosperity of our community, not only from the economic standpoint, to which the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Keliher, addressed himself so ably, but from the point of view of the best citizenship of our Republic. Mr. Chairman, the unfortunate people of

European stock who come from countries where, by reason of governmental incapacity or oppression, the advantages of education have not been opened to them for many generations, are still the same men under their skin, of the same blood and the same stock as other European emigrants to this country who are educated. Give them a chance and they will educate themselves immediately in our country. Give us a chance to employ them upon our rough labor and it will immensely increase the economic prosperity of our country.

Mr. BURNETT. Do you think the south Italians are of the same stock as those from northwestern Europe?

Mr. HARRISON. He is not of the same stock as those from northwestern Europe, but is of the same stock as many educated Italians who come over here, and in my judgment he should not be discriminated against on educational grounds.

Mr. HAYES. May I ask you, do you think that education tends to elevate a man or not?

Mr. HARRISON. Of course, it tends to elevate him.

Mr. HAYES. Do you think it tends to make them better citizens or not?

Mr. HARRISON. Well, personally I view with abhorrence the educational test as a prerequisite even for citizenship; but I venture to suggest to the gentleman that that is not the subject before this committee; you are now talking about immigration, not about citizenship.

Mr. HAYES. I think it is. Do you not recognize that the results of education are transmitted by heredity?

Mr. HARRISON. I recognize no such thing.

Mr. HAYES. You do not think, then, that intelligence is transmitted by heredity?

Mr. HARRISON. I think character is transmitted by heredity.

Mr. HAYES. Not capacity or intelligence?

Mr. HARRISON. Character, but not education.

Mr. HAYES. But not capacity?

Mr. HARRISON. Well, in so far as character constitutes capacity, certainly. But, answering the gentleman further, I would rather have an immigrant come into this country with his mind open to receive the benefits of American education than to have a man educated in an abortive and improper view of life which he obtained under an improper system of education in some other country.

Mr. HAYES. I quite agree with you; but what I am trying to get at is this, as to progeny, the result of generations of ignorance and squalor; I want to ask if you think that that kind of progeny would have the same capacity and the same character, if you please to put it that way, as the progeny that comes from a long line of intelligent and self-reliant and educated people?

Mr. HARRISON. To answer the gentleman I will ask him in all fairness whether he believes that the discrimination he would practice against these immigrants on an educational ground would not lie equally well against the enormous section of our own native-born citizens who are, unhappily, unable to read or write?

Mr. HAYES. I know of no such body of citizens; in my section of the country there is no such body of citizens.

Mr. HARRISON. Well, the gentleman is fortunate. I will say further that in the congressional district I represent in the House the

second generation of incoming aliens have contributed greatly to our welfare and will enhance the value of the whole body politic. For my part, I think a man who is not able to write is just as good with a hoe or shovel as the man who is able to write, and that the man of European stock from a part of Europe where such an opportunity is not given, is just as able to prove himself a worthy candidate for citizenship as the man from there who is able to write. I therefore hope that the committee will vote down this clause in the bill.

Mr. HAYES. May I ask the gentleman another question? Have you ever employed labor to any large extent?

Mr. HARRISON. I have not.

Mr. HAYES. Well, I have, and I want to say that my experience is that a man with some education and some development of the intellect can, even with the hoe, do a great deal more and better work than the man who is not educated.

Mr. HARRISON. The gentleman also knows that a man who has the character of a scoundrel is ten thousand times more dangerous if he is educated than if he is not?

Mr. HAYES. We all recognize that.

Mr. KELIHER. Do you consider the ability to read and write the sole mark of intelligence?

Mr. HAYES. Of course not.

Mr. KELIHER. These people may naturally be a very intelligent people, but because of lack of opportunity to get a schooling may be unable to read. I have in mind a man in my city who could recite Shakespeare through and through, but he could not read a line; it had been read to him on board ship and he could not read a line.

Mr. HAYES. Of course, there are among all peoples what we know as geniuses; I am speaking of the great body of the people.

Mr. KELIHER. The answer to that is that we are going to legislate for the future as well as for the present, and it is proven by our governmental reports, and proven to my satisfaction by personal observation, that the children of these illiterates as you describe them, become very literate.

Mr. HAYES. Of course, we are spending a good many millions of dollars for education, and if it is not accomplishing anything for the future, I think it is poorly spent.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Harrison probably has more Italians in his district than any other Representative, at least he has an extremely large number, and I would like to ask him: What are the second generation of the Italians, the children of 10 to 15 years of age, doing in relation to education in your district?

Mr. HARRISON. I believe they are the prize children in our public schools, and they are among the best educated when they get through with them; and instead of devoting themselves to manual occupations, as their parents did, they are going into professions and helping to build up the community in that way. If you are going to shut out what you call this illiterate labor you are not going to have, in a few years, any labor, because these people do not stay as laborers.

Mr. HAYES. This whole matter is one of cheap labor; you can get all the labor you want if you will pay for it.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Harrison, if that is correct, if that labor is to be exhausted, how are we going to supply that labor, if these people

who are educated stay out of the laboring work? Wouldn't the same man, the American man, go back to it?

Mr. HARRISON. I do not think so; that is a very serious problem, and we must not now do anything to hamper it.

Mr. BENNET. Do these Italian parents who are, for the most part, uneducated, keep the children in school or not in school?

Mr. HARRISON. They keep them in school, as the chairman has stated, proportionately more than the children of any other race. I thank the chairman for giving me an opportunity to restate what he has stated.

(At 12 o'clock m. the committee adjourned, to meet Monday, March 14, 1910, at 10.30 o'clock a. m.)

MARCH 15, 1910.

Representative Howell, chairman of the committee, received a letter from Josiah C. Pumpelly, of New York, relative to the attitude of the Union League Club, of New York City, on the immigration question. He also received a communication from Hon. C. S. Deneen, governor of Illinois, relative to his views on the subject of immigration, and correspondence of Governor Deneen with Julian Mack, president of the League for the Protection of Immigrants. The Deneen correspondence follows:

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Springfield, March 16, 1910.

DEAR SIR: Hon. Julian Mack, president of the League for the Protection of Immigrants and judge of the Illinois appellate court at Chicago, wrote to me on the 10th instant calling my attention to a letter submitted to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization by Mr. David Ross, secretary of the bureau of labor statistics of the State of Illinois, dated May 21, 1907, to which he takes exception. Judge Mack has requested me to express to your committee my views upon this subject.

I inclose herewith a copy of Judge Mack's letter of the 10th instant and a copy of my reply thereto. These are self-explanatory, and will answer the purpose of giving you my views upon the subject to which Judge Mack has called my attention.

I should be pleased to have the correspondence of Judge Mack and myself incorporated in the hearings on immigration bills should you hereafter publish any other matter of a similar character to that published in your report of May 4, 1910.

Respectfully, yours,

(Signed) C. S. DENEEN.

Hon. BENJAMIN HOWELL,
*Chairman Committee on Immigration,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

CHICAGO, *March 10, 1910*

Hon. CHARLES S. DENEEN,
Springfield, Ill.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: In the report of the hearings on immigration bills before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House of Representatives, under date of March 4, 1910, there appears a communication from the president of the National Board of Trade, inclosing copies of numerous answers received by him from governors of most of the States and other men of prominence, in answer to a circular letter sent out by him in reference to the effect of immigration on this country.

At page 22 there appears a letter bearing date May 21, 1907; I inclose herewith printed copy.

If Mr. Ross is correct in his statement that he was expressing your sentiments, then the matter is extremely serious.

I want to call your special attention to the statement: "Over 50 per cent of our foreign immigrants come from southern Europe, are of Slavic origin, and therefore represent a very low order of civilization."

The "therefore" is a direct insult to all people from southern Europe, and particularly to all people of Slavic origin.

Personally, of course, I have not the slightest interest in this matter. My people are not of Slavic origin and do not come from southern Europe. But, as an American, as president of the League for the Protection of Immigrants, and as a student, I most respectfully protest against such an utterly absurd characterization and condemnation not merely of one nation, but of many nations and races.

The fact that 25 per cent of the foreign immigrants in the year 1906, if that be a fact, were unable to read or write does not permit of the conclusion stated that these people are of inferior blood. As we all know, in many European countries the best and sturdiest of the poor people are denied the opportunity of education, and we further know that they not only take full advantage of the opportunities afforded in America of giving their children an education, but they themselves, even as adults, are eager in every way to improve their opportunities here.

You will observe that the conclusions reached by the National Board of Trade, on consideration of the many responses received by them, are completely at variance with the conclusions stated by Mr. Ross.

Knowing you as well as I do, I feel certain that this letter does not express your sentiments, and I deem it important, both as a matter of justice to the people so grossly insulted in this letter and as an evidence of my sincere friendship for you, to call your attention to it and to suggest to you that you write a letter to the Committee on Immigration, expressing your own views of the subject, which I am sure are just as liberal as those of any man in the State.

I shall be glad to talk this matter over with you at any time if you care to do so. I shall be glad also of an opportunity to make some suggestions to you in regard to the south side state employment agency, as to which I wrote you some time ago.

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) JULIAN MACK.

MARCH 14, 1910.

MY DEAR JUDGE: Your letter of the 10th instant, together with a copy of the report of hearings on immigration bills, dated March 4, 1910, was delivered to me at the Union League Club, Chicago.

I am greatly obliged to you for calling my attention to the letter of Mr. Ross of May 21, 1907. Your communication gives me the first information I have received regarding the contents of his letter. From the contents of Mr. Ross's letter, it is evident that Mr. Trenor's letter must have been received at my office and referred by my secretary, in ordinary course, to Mr. Ross for answer. Had I received any information about the contents of Mr. Ross's letter, I should have directed him not to send it.

The letter does not express my views regarding immigration from southern Europe or that of Slavic origin. It is entirely contrary to the opinions I entertain and have often expressed upon this subject. Nor is the letter in harmony with the views of the citizens of this State, as I understand them. We have a large number of citizens of Slavic origin and from southern Europe who are among our most industrious citizens.

I believe I express the sentiments of the people of Illinois, as well as my own, when I say that they favor no test for immigrants except that of character and fitness for citizenship. These tests are abundantly met by the great body of immigrants of Slavic origin and those from southern Europe to whom Mr. Ross has made such an unfortunate reference.

I thank you for your suggestion that I communicate my views to the Committee on Immigration so that the attitude of our State in this matter may not be misinterpreted.

Yours truly,

(Signed) C. S. DENEEN.

Hon. JULIAN MACK,
Illinois Appellate Court,
Ashland Block, Chicago, Ill.

The letter from Mr. Pumpelly follows:

542 WEST ONE HUNDRED AND TWELFTH STREET,
New York, March 4, 1910.

HON. BENJAMIN F. HOWELL,
*Chairman of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization,
House of Representatives, Capitol, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: As the committee on political reform of the Union League Club has received many letters regarding this report on restriction and regulation of immigration, and desiring that there may be no misunderstanding of the matter on the part of your committee, I take the liberty of writing to you direct and to request that you will, if such course seems fitting, have the following statement and resolutions published in the hearings of your committee.

As a veteran member of the Union League Club of New York, and feeling that as a club, conspicuous for nearly half a century for its loyal advocacy of American ideals, it could not be indifferent on this important subject of immigration. I offered at our meeting December 9, 1909, the following preamble and resolution:

"Whereas the Republican party in its national platform of 1896 and 1900 declares that 'in the further interest of American workmen we favor a more effective restriction of cheap labor from foreign lands;' and

"Whereas the foreign steamship companies are now bringing to this country a far less desirable class of aliens than formerly, many of whom, being single men, are able and willing to live in a manner impossible for decent American citizens, and thus drive the latter out of employment and into a miserable and sometimes dependent condition; and

"Whereas the coming of enormous numbers of such a class of foreigners is already tending to undermine our national institutions and standards of living and to alter the public ideals, driving many of our citizens into Canada, and causing a lessening of the birthrate among those already here; and

"Whereas our present immigration laws are inadequate to deal with this matter and to prevent the entrance of many aliens, who quickly become inmates of our prisons, hospitals, and asylums for the insane, and burdens upon public and private charity; and

"Whereas the enactment of proper laws, which are desired by our people, has been repeatedly defeated through the organized effort of the steamship companies and the employers of cheap labor, and especially by various societies of foreign-born residents organized on racial lines, Now therefore

"Be it resolved by the Union League Club of New York City, That we heartily indorse the attitude of the present administration and of the present Commissioner of Immigration of the port of New York in their more efficient enforcement of the existing laws; and be it further

"Resolved, That we urge upon Congress the immediate enactment of laws adopting or closely following the lines of the Overman bill (H. R. 1438) to secure the selection of a better class of immigrants by means of an increase of the head tax to at least \$10, the exclusion of adult aliens who are unable to read some language or dialect, and of those who have not enough money in their possession to support them while trying to find work and to carry them to their avowed destination, and such other measures as will exclude all aliens who are below the mental, moral, and physical average of our citizens; and be it further

"Resolved, That we are opposed to the plan proposed in some quarters of free government transportation to immigrants seeking work in the West or South and to government aid in distributing such aliens, realizing that such plans, being known abroad, will inevitably result in the coming of constantly increasing numbers and not of the class desired; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, the Speaker of the National House of Representatives, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress of the State of New York."

This resolution being deemed too important to be discussed and decided upon at that meeting, was referred on vote to the committee on political reform, with request that it report on the same at the meeting in February, 1910.

The said committee, after very careful consideration, did on February 10, at a regular meeting of the club, make the following report:

"To the Union League Club:

"The committee on political reform begs leave to report that at the December meeting of the club the resolution presented by Mr. Pumpelly in respect of immigration was referred to this committee by a vote of the club with directions to report in regard thereon at the February meeting.

"The committee has given a great deal of time to an investigation of the facts, and to the consideration of the various arguments which have been made in regard to the immigration laws. The subject is one of paramount importance and the club is, as the committee believes, under great obligations to the member who brought the matter to its attention. It involves large interests, and requires the most careful attention and the most deliberate action, if proper action is to be taken. It is now being subjected to a most careful and thorough investigation by a special committee appointed by Congress upon which are members of both the Senate and of the House. A very large sum of money is said to have been expended in this investigation, probably more than one-half a million of dollars. The report of that commission has not yet been made. It is understood, however, that it will be made some time during the present session of Congress.

"Your committee is unwilling to ask the club to take definite action upon this great subject in advance of the publication of the report above referred to. It will undoubtedly add much important and reliable information to the mass of facts and consideration already in possession by the public and all undoubtedly worthy of thoughtful attention. Your committee, therefore, begs to say that it does not feel justified in the present condition of this great discussion to recommend the adoption of the resolution presented by Mr. Pumpelly, a copy of which is annexed thereto. It is, however, willing to, and does recommend, the adoption of the following resolution which embraces some of the topics suggested in the resolution referred to it.

"Dated, New York, February 9, 1910."

"Whereas the Republican party has declared in its national platforms of 1896 and 1900 that, in the interest of the American workingman, it favors a more effective restriction of cheap labor from foreign lands; and

"Whereas many of the immigrants now landing in this country are of a less desirable class than those of former years; and

"Whereas the coming of great numbers of such class tends, by the changing of standards of living and the lowering of public ideals, to undermine our national institutions: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Union League Club, of New York City*, That we heartily indorse the attitude of the present national administration and of the present commissioner of immigration of the port of New York, as manifested in the more efficient enforcement of existing laws;

"*Resolved*, That we demand in every port of entry in the United States a strict enforcement of that provision of the present law which excludes 'all persons who are found to be and are certified by the examining surgeon as being mentally and physically defective, such mental or physical defect being of a nature which may affect the ability of such alien to earn a living;'

"*Resolved*, That we favor such amendments to the present law as will authorize the deportation of any immigrant who becomes a public charge for any cause within one year of landing, and as will permit the deportation within one year after landing of such persons as were, in fact, at time of landing, paupers, or likely to become public charges, even though such disability was not detected at the time of said landing;

"*Resolved*, That we urge upon Congress the enactment of laws which will secure the selection of a better class of immigrants by the exclusion of such adult aliens as are unable to read a language or dialect and of such as have not in their possession sufficient money to assure their support while seeking employment; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, the Speaker of the National House of Representatives, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress of the State of New York."

The above was mailed to me from the office of the secretary of the Union League Club.

Personally, I am in favor of the passage of the bill presented by Congressman E. A. Hayes, of California, as I believe it to be an admirable and greatly needed restrictive and regulative measure, and I was fully prepared at the meeting to present the provisions of both this and the Overman bill, so that our members could have voted intelligently as to recommending the enactment of one or both.

However, I am pleased that our club so unanimously passed this resolution, and I trust their action will meet with the approval of your honorable committee.

Please inform me of your receipt of this communication, and send me a copy of your printed proceedings.

With much respect, I am,

Yours, very truly,

(Signed)

JOSIAH C. PUMPELLY.

Other letters received by Mr. Howell follow:

Washington, D. C., March 14, 1910.

Hon. BENJAMIN F. HOWELL,
Chairman Committee on Immigration,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to inclose herewith copy of resolution adopted by the Republican League of Clubs of the State of New York at its annual convention held in Syracuse, N. Y., on the 11th instant.

Very respectfully,

JNO. J. D. TRENOR,
Chairman, Committee on Special Organization,
Republican League of Clubs of the State of New York.

Whereas the United States Government, from its inception, has welcomed worthy immigrants, and

Whereas immigration from foreign countries has so largely contributed to our up-building by furnishing the basic labor necessary to our work of unparalleled development, and without which much progress would have been impossible, and

Whereas the vast majority of immigrants have in themselves, and in their children, shown an earnest and marked disposition to imbibe the true spirit of our free institutions, thereby becoming worthy citizens, and

Whereas existing laws, properly enforced, offer an adequate safeguard against the undesirable or criminal classes, and

Whereas the present head tax is amply sufficient to meet all necessary expenses of the enforcement of the immigration laws:

Resolved, That the Republican League of Clubs of the State of New York, in annual session assembled, is heartily in favor of continuing immigration of those morally and physically fit, and is strongly opposed to both the so-called educational test, and to any increase in the head tax levied on immigrants.

(Signed)

JNO. J. D. TRENOR, *Chairman*.
ARTHUR F. DAY.
EDWARD W. DUFFIE.
FRANK L. FRUGONE.
SALVATORE PELLETTIERI.

SYRACUSE, N. Y., March 11, 1910.

THE STATE SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURE,
Morrisville, N. Y., March 21, 1910.

The following resolutions were adopted at a recent meeting of the board of trustees of the State School of Agriculture, at Morrisville:

“Resolved, That it is the opinion of the board of trustees of the State School of Agriculture, at Morrisville, N. Y., that one of the crying needs of the farmers of the State of New York and of the country at large is an adequate supply of intelligent farm labor; and this board gives its hearty approval to any action which can or may be taken by the National Congress or the legislature of the State of New York to supply such labor through the enlargement of the present national bureau of distribution, and the creation by New York State of the proposed bureau recommended by the state commission, which in 1908-9 investigated labor conditions in New York.

“Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this board and copies thereof forwarded to the proper authorities at Albany and Washington.

“Resolved, That the secretary of this board be directed to carry on the purpose of these resolutions.”

Yours, truly,

(Signed)

JOHN H. BROAD,
Secretary.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Monday, March 14, 1910.

The committee met at 11 o'clock a. m., Hon. Benjamin F. Howell (chairman) presiding. Others present were Representatives Hayes, Burnett, Sabath, Moore, of Pennsylvania, and O'Connell.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN L. BURNETT, A REPRESENTATIVE
FROM THE STATE OF ALABAMA.

Mr. BURNETT. I want to file, without going over it again, the remarks I submitted some two years ago on the question of the illiteracy test, and enlarge a little on that:

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I want, at the outset, to offer a few suggestions in favor of what is known as the educational test, and I desire to state that in doing so I am not a "Know-nothing," and I am not one of those who subscribe to the doctrine of "America for Americans" alone. I believe that this educational test will give us a better class of immigration—that is, more of the better class—and at the same time will reduce those that most of us, at least, believe are not the better class, to say nothing as to whether they are desirable or not.

I have not looked at the Gardner bill, but I want to read, for the benefit of the committee, the bill that I presume it is, the section that we reported at the first session of the last Congress, in order to show by that, as I think I can, that it is a conservative measure; that it is not extreme in any way whatever. It is section 38 of the bill that was reported—not the bill that was passed; because the bill as passed virtually substituted a commission, of which I am a member, and of which the chairman of this committee and Mr. Bennet are members, and which really, I think, was created for the purpose of preventing any legislation along restrictive lines at that time. Although I was fortunate in being a member of that commission, yet I am free to say that I believe that that amendment was made as a subterfuge, for the purpose of postponing and delaying restrictive legislation, if not defeating it entirely.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Mr. Burnett, let me ask you a question right there. Have you not been convinced, from making that trip, that it was a good idea to send some committee or commission over there?

Mr. BURNETT. I thought that all the time, that it was a very good idea; but I did not believe it was a good idea to postpone legislation that we needed at once by doing that. I think we have gained some information that will be of value to the country; but I believe that immediate action on the part of Congress at that time would have been better for the country than any good that can grow out of the appointment of a commission.

Mr. SABATH. What section did you refer to a while ago?

Mr. BURNETT. It is section 38 as reported. You will find it in the bill as reported by the committee, Mr. Sabath—section 38. It reads as follows:

"That no alien over 16 years of age physically capable of reading shall be admitted to the United States until he has proved to the satisfaction of the proper inspection officers that he can read English or some other language or dialect."

There is a great misconception, Mr. Chairman, in regard to what we who favor the educational test were advocating at that time and advocate still. We did not require them to even read and write English; but we allowed them, if they could read English or some other language or dialect, to come in. That word "dialect" was put in there, as I remember it, for the purpose especially of meeting the case of the people in Russia who read and spoke the Yiddish dialect, that has not risen to the dignity of a distinct and separate language. Reading further from section 38:

"And the Secretary of Commerce and Labor is hereby authorized and directed to prescribe from time to time such methods and rules as he may think best for the purpose of testing the ability of such immigrants to read."

It did not stop even there. It goes on and says:

"*Provided*, That an admissible alien over 16 years of age, or a person now or hereafter in the United States of like age, may bring in or send for his wife, his mother, his grandmother, his affianced wife, his father who is over 55 years of age, or his grandfather, if they are otherwise admissible, whether they are able to read or not; and such persons shall be permitted to land: *Provided further*, That a daughter not exceeding 21 years of age or a son not exceeding 18 years of age, otherwise admissible, if

accompanying an admissible alien father or mother, shall be permitted to land whether said daughter or son is able to read or not."

It strikes me that that is not an extreme educational test. The purpose of it, so far as I was concerned, Mr. Chairman, was not to keep away the people of the desirable countries of Europe; and I want to call attention here to the effect that it would have so far as those countries are concerned.

We will take, for instance, the people from the country of which my distinguished friend here, Mr. Sabath, is a native—Bohemia. Only 2 per cent of those even over 14 years of age—2 out of every 100—would be excluded. And when we increase the age to 16 years it would be perhaps less than 2 per cent of his nationality that would be cut off. As to the nationality that my friend, Mr. Küstermann, represents (the Germans), there would be cut off only 7 per cent of those who are over 14 years of age. And, as I say, the bill went to 16 and exempted quite a number of other relatives, as you saw by the reading of the section. In the case of the Irish, who we all think are desirable people, as we do these other people that I have just mentioned, there would not be more than 2.2 per cent of them affected by this bill—less, really, perhaps, than the percentage of our own people on this side of the water who can not read.

So, you see, gentlemen, that it is not an extreme educational test that we advocated then or that we are advocating now; and that is upon a basis of those over 14 years of age, whereas our bill only applied to those that were over 16 years of age. And even then, as I said, it admitted a great many others who come within the scope of the relatives that were exempted there.

As I said a moment ago, this is not to my mind, simply for the purpose of excluding a lot of people who I feel are undesirable; but it is for the purpose of encouraging a greater influx of the nationalities of northwestern Europe that can come up to the test and be admitted. In my travels in Europe as a member of this commission I found this proposition, especially among the German people: I said, "Why is it that so few of your people are now coming to America?" "Well," one of them said, "one thing is that we are doing better; our country is prospering better than it has been, and emigration is really discouraged by our people and by the officials of the country;" and I think that is true. Another reason, expressed by several of them that I talked to, was this: "Because too many of the low-priced laborers from southern Europe are going to America. Now, why should we, who are doing well at home, go to America to come in competition with them? Possibly, while wages are good and work is plenty, there will be no very great depression; but whenever there come hard times, and a crisis is impending, then we will come in competition with that low class of labor."

There is another thing, Mr. Chairman, in that regard: The people from these countries that I have mentioned, especially those that I have called attention to, and I might say the French, the English (very few of the French come), the Germans, the Scandinavians, the Scotch, and all the people of northwestern Europe, usually come as homeseekers. They come for the purpose of making their homes among the people of this country. When you come to the Italians, the south Italians especially, because in the case of the north Italians, as I will show directly, only 10 per cent of them would be cut off; and they are people who go into the country, who go to the farms, who come for the purpose, a great many of them, of locating and remaining in our country—when you take the south Italians, the Greeks, the Syrians, and those people bordering immediately along the shores of the Mediterranean, as a rule they come for the purpose of getting American money and either sending it back to their homes or returning with it after a while.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Mr. Burnett, excuse me for a question.

Mr. BURNETT. Certainly.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I just happened to come across a little extract from a paper which I would like to refer to. You spoke of the Greeks.

Mr. BURNETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. We have quite a number of the Greeks in our State, especially in Milwaukee. This paper says that Milwaukee now has a colony of about 3,000 Greeks, most of whom are industrious, hard-working residents.

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Now, we are satisfied with the Greeks; and if you do not like them in your State we will take them in ours.

Mr. BURNETT. That might be true in many localities, Mr. Chairman, as to the Jap and the Chinaman, too. They are industrious people. They are just as industrious as the Greek or the Italian or the American. They are a thrifty people, too; and some localities, as I have no doubt I can prove by my distinguished friend from California (Mr. Hayes), would like to get them. But the question is, Mr. Chairman,

is it for the common good, the common weal of the great American people, and those that come here for the purpose of helping to build up their homes and build up our country, that these people should come in in great numbers?

I want now to call your attention——

Mr. O'CONNELL. Before you pass on will you let me ask you a question?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. O'CONNELL. How do you explain the fact that the Northeastern States, such as Pennsylvania, New York, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and Massachusetts, are very densely populated with home builders, and that those homes are composed of these people whom you talk about, whereas in your part of the country, where no immigration has come, you have not this state of affairs?

Mr. BURNETT. What state of affairs?

Mr. O'CONNELL. The homes; you have not the great number of homes that we have.

Mr. BURNETT. Why, you are altogether mistaken in regard to that. I expect, Mr. Chairman, that when you come to the South you will find more people in proportion to population owning their own homes than you will find in the Northeast.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Not for the territory.

Mr. HAYES. Oh, yes; you are mistaken about that.

Mr. BURNETT. Yes; you are altogether mistaken about that.

Mr. O'CONNELL. No; I am not mistaken about that. Your State of Alabama is not nearly as densely populated as mine is.

Mr. BURNETT. Why, of course not. In your cities they are congested and crowded in the tenement houses. That is where the great number of them have gone, and not to the country.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Oh, but you are wrong about that, so far as up in my country is concerned.

Mr. BURNETT. I will state this as another proposition; and I believe that every gentleman, whether he agrees with me or not, will bear me out in it, that most of the people from these undesirable sections do not go to the country. They huddle and herd and congest in the great cities of the Northeast. Take the great city of New York. Nearly every Italian that comes over here has his way paid to New York, and thence a few of them to some other city, perhaps. They do not go to the country. I undertake to say that in New England or anywhere else you do not find one in ten thousand, or perhaps one in twenty thousand, of the south Italian immigrants who goes to the country and seeks his home in the country. As I said a moment ago, that is not true to so great an extent with the north Italians, and those right along the same line. The Bohemians over 14 years of age who came last year were 11,015 in number; of that entire 11,015 there were only 216 over 14 years of age that could not read. Those are all that would be cut out, Mr. Chairman. Then you take the Finnish—while they are Russian citizens, in a Russian country, they are up there contiguous to the Scandinavians, to Norway and Sweden, and they are virtually of the same class of people. Although they are under the same laws with many of the illiterates of Russia, although they have the same King and the same legislative bodies, of the 13,893 who came only 351 were illiterates.

Take the English, and of 43,144 who came there were only 536 illiterates. Of the French, of 8,390 who came there were only 170 illiterates. Of the Germans, of 78,091 who came there were only 5,310 illiterates. Of the Greeks, of 45,464 who came—I mean over 14 years of age in each of these statements—there were 13,883 that could not read a word even of their own language. And here in passing let me remark, Mr. Chairman, that there were really more of each one of these nationalities that could not read than I have stated, because no test was applied to them. The mere question is asked by the men in charge of the immigration stations as to whether they can read or write or not. Then these people state, without any test being applied, as to whether they are able to read or write, and no doubt many of them state falsely as to this.

Of the Irish, there were 36,463 that came who were over 14 years of age, and only 713 of them were unable to read. Of the north Italians—now, here I want to call your attention again to the difference between the north and the south Italians. Of the north Italians there were 47,555 who came, and only 4,741 who were unable to read—about 10 per cent. Of the south Italians there were 217,607 who came, and 115,803 of them over 14 years of age were unable to read. Of the Russians there were 16,000 in round numbers who came, and there were 6,998 who were unable to read. Of the Scandinavians there were 47,500 who came, and only 475 who were unable to read. Of the Scotch there were 17,274 who came, and of the illiterates there were only 149; while of the Syrians there were 5,216 who came, and of that number there were 2,370 who were unable to read.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that when we can contrast the north Italian with the south Italian we find only one cause for the difference. They have the same King, the same Parliament, the same laws; and yet the man north of the mountains is of the Caucasian, the white race, and the other is of the mixed race. I talked down there with Mr. Rossi, who was the commissioner of emigration of Italy, or one of them, and I said to him: "Mr. Rossi, what is the reason of the difference in the illiteracy of the south Italian and of the north Italian?" He said: "It is simply a result of the difference in color." The Greeks are the same way; the Syrians are the same way, mixed up with the Arabians and the people of African and western Asiatic countries, until they are not our kind of people; and they are not the kind of people from which those who settled this country sprang.

Look at the difference—and it is significant—in the way they have been coming in for quite a number of years. Up until about 1882 nearly all of those that came were from the most desirable people of northwestern Europe. About that time there began to be a great influx of people from the Mediterranean Sea countries, and that continued; and in 1890 and 1891 and 1892 it increased so greatly that the restrictive law that we have was demanded by the people of the country as a necessity. I undertake to say, Mr. Chairman, that if only the people who were the ancestors of ourselves, and of the gentlemen around this table who honor me with their attention, had continued to come, there never would have been any necessity for, and there never would to-day have been upon the statute books of the country, the restriction in regard to contract labor and in regard to assisted immigration that there is. Why was it brought about? Because of the recognized necessity as these undesirable people increased in numbers, of having some kind of a restriction. It was demanded not only, Mr. Chairman, by the labor unions of the country, but it was demanded by the civilization of America, that there should be some kind of limit and some kind of restriction; and and this was the restriction that was hit upon. And I believe that if the great influx of these people could be gotten rid of in the course of a few years those restrictions would be broken down, and America would say to the northwestern European, as it said before: "You come along. Our doors are open." They would not be cut out by the educational test, as I have shown to you from this reading, scarcely at all. We would continue to get them. And yet of the south Italians more than 50 per cent would be cut out, while of their north Italian brothers but 10 per cent would go. Of the Greeks about forty-odd per cent would be cut out; and yet of the Bohemians, farther north of them, only 2 per cent would go. Of the Syrians, from 40 to 50 per cent, perhaps, would be cut out; and yet of the Scandinavians only about 2 per cent would be excluded, and of the Irish about a like number.

It seems to me that this is the way to increase the desirable immigration, and I think that we can plant ourselves upon that conservative position and say that instead of being in favor of restricting the right kind of immigration—that which helped to build up and develop America—we are in favor of it, and this is the way to increase it. I believe that we can go before our fellow-countrymen and show to them that condition.

There is another thing about the south Italian; he herds in the cities and towns over there. He does not live in the country. He does not live out on the farms. Even those that do farm work live in their villages and work out from their farms. Then, what is more natural for him when he comes to America than to herd in the great cities of the country, where he finds his own people? As was stated by Mr. Rothermel, I believe, the other day, they are clannish people; everybody knows that that is true so far as the Sicilian and the south Italian people are concerned. They go among their own people when they come to America and continue to congest in these crowded cities of the Northeast and of the Middle West, until, Mr. Chairman, they are breeding much of the crime there, so that they have had in New York to establish a special detective bureau for the purpose of arresting the Italian criminals, and Mr. Joe Petrosini is the chief of that bureau, himself an Italian, I believe.

I want to read you now what Mr. Caughy—referred to the other day in such high terms by one Mr. Bennett—the American consul at Messina, has said of the south Italian. Mr. Bennett spoke of him in his statement a few days ago in high terms, and referred to the fact that he had been for fourteen years an American consul in that country. Let me see if my views in this regard are not reenforced by the statements of that American consul, who has been on the ground for fourteen years.

In a letter written in May, 1906, by Mr. Caughy to Mr. White, the American ambassador at Rome, this is what he says:

"After nearly thirteen years' residence in Sicily, during which period I have tried to study the emigration question in all its phases, I have arrived at the conclusion that both Italy and America would benefit by its restriction; the fields of the former that now lie fallow for lack of labor to cultivate them would become pro-

ductive, and the prisons and reformatories of the latter would not be overcrowded by a class of foreigners whose treacherous characteristics are such that a special arm of the detective service had to be created to keep them in check."

That is true. That is the special branch of the service that I referred to that exists in New York.

As an evidence of their fighting characteristics, I want to call attention to this fact: I believe the chairman of this committee was present when we boarded one of the ships, I think, sailing from Naples. The steamship companies generally prepared for us when they knew we were coming, but sometimes they would "slip up," and would not have all their preparations made; and on the deck of this ship we saw a large basket of knives. You were present, I believe, Mr. Chairman, at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. I think it was the chairman who asked, "What are these knives all doing here?" The answer was, "Those are knives taken away from the Italians that are going to take passage in the steerage." Mr. Howell, I believe, asked, "Why is that?" "Well," he answered, "it would never do to allow those Italians to go across in the steerage with all those knives, because they would cut and carve each other up on the way."

That, gentlemen, is the class of people that we are objecting to. We say we are encouraging your people, my brother, to Mr. Küstermann, and we are encouraging your people [referring to members of the committee] by shutting off this influx of these other people; and that is one of the purposes that I have in view in contending for that kind of a test.

If they were all of the desirable nationalities, if they were all of the same class of people as the ancestors of these gentlemen, I do not believe there is a man that would raise his voice against them. But we do believe that our civilization is endangered. It is not simply a question of the dollar mark, Mr. Chairman. Cut yourself loose from that and look into other considerations that your children and mine will have to face hereafter; and it is one of the most serious (and in fact probably the most serious) propositions that there is in it. Here is a man who for thirteen years, when he wrote this—and he reaffirmed it last summer, as you know in talking with us there in Naples—a man who has been down for fourteen years among those people—

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Burnett—pardon me—is it fair for him to criticise the situation in America if he has been over there thirteen years? That just occurs to me.

Mr. BURNETT. He is criticising the situation over there.

Mr. O'CONNELL. But he is talking about the way they go into prisons here. What right has he to talk about the situation in New England?

Mr. BURNETT. That is a matter of common knowledge. Why, Mr. Joe Petrosini, in an interview that I have right here with me, shows that to-day 132 of them are doing time in Sing Sing prison on account of the "Black Hand," and you can not pick up a newspaper, Mr. Chairman, without seeing an account of these "Black Hand" atrocities in Pittsburg or Chicago or New York or some other of the great cities.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Did not that apply back in the days when the Irish came here in such great numbers? Did they not have the "Molly Maguires" and other societies that excited just the same feeling that you have been speaking of?

Mr. BURNETT. Why, for a little while; but that was not true except in some localities, and now it is everywhere where the south Italian lives in large numbers. I noticed just the other day that in Bessemer, near Birmingham, Ala., where they have a "Black Hand" organization, they had demanded of an Italian citizen who had made some money that he should put \$8,000 at a certain place, by a certain tree, or else his life would be forfeited, and he said, "I know that they will kill me unless I do." Those things occurred for a while in the early demoralized condition of the country. The "Molly Maguires" were off here in Pennsylvania, and there was a demoralized country there at the time; but the "Black Hand" exists in cities, such as New York and Chicago and Birmingham and New Orleans, and wherever a large number of Italians have assembled together, without regard to whether it is a civilized community or a community that is disrupted.

Mr. HAYES. Excuse me. My friend over here [Mr. O'Connell] would not claim for a moment that the doings of the "Molly Maguires" were characteristic of the Irish race.

Mr. O'CONNELL. No; and for the same reason I do not admit that this is characteristic of the Italian race.

Mr. BURNETT. It is of a very large per cent of it.

Mr. O'CONNELL. I claim that it is something of the same kind, and that it will and must pass away.

Mr. BURNETT. Well, Mr. Chairman, it was characteristic of them for centuries back yonder. You were not with us, I believe, in the trip to Sicily; but down there we had read and heard of the acts of the brigands of southern Italy and of Sicily, and we asked them, "Where are your brigands now?" They said, "They have all gone to America." While it is true that many of the leaders are of the more educated class, yet the very clannishness of those people, Mr. Chairman, is such that they hide their criminals and are afraid to open their mouths and give them up to the police courts of the country.

Let me read on now from this man, because he is talking about that country, and is speaking of conditions over here that he has read of and heard of, and that we know to be true:

"It is said that the emigrant from upper Italy is sober, industrious, and makes a good citizen. I fear that the same can not be said of the one from Sicily or Calabria."

Mr. Bennet made an automobile trip through Calabria, and gave us some valuable information; but here is a man who is just across the little channel that separates Sicily from Calabria, and who knows the people over there, and he says that the same that is said of the north Italians can not be said of the people of Sicily and Calabria, the southern Italians.

"The money he earns never sees the light of day after it finds its way to repose between the filthy linings of his leather wallet. His living expenses are about 40 cents a day, and the hogs in an American farmer's pen are more cleanly in their surroundings and habits than are he and his dozen associates, who huddle together in one room and exist like animals, not human beings."

And we found that this was true in that deserted village that Mr. Bennet spoke of the other day, a little way out from Messina. We found there in some dirty huts the people, the goats, the chickens, and the children all huddled together in one room, and the fleas working by the millions.

"When the wallet is well swollen, he puts the contents in a registered letter and sends it to his relatives here, who change it into Italian currency and deposit it in the post-office bank. The money changer pays about 5.05 lire, and for that reason a person in need of American money can always buy \$2,000 or \$3,000 in bank notes for from 5.10 to 5.12 lire, while the price in New York would be 5.18 lire. Sometimes instead of sending it he brings it himself. In that case he appears upon the scene with a flashy suit, a top hat, a filled chain, and a brass watch and struts among his former associates—a second Gulliver, a giant among pygmies."

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. That is, when he goes back over there you see what American civilization has done for the man.

Mr. BURNETT. Yes, sir; it has furnished him with a gilded chain and all those other things.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Pardon me, Mr. Burnett, who is this man that writes this?

Mr. BURNETT. This is Mr. Caughey, an American consul—and, by the way, he was appointed by Mr. Cleveland, of whom, I believe, the East is very fond.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Not all of us.

Mr. BURNETT. That is so; we reciprocate on that. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'CONNELL. I guess he indicates that he is one of the same class.

Mr. BURNETT. He has been kept there, at least, Mr. Chairman, during every administration since the administration of Mr. Cleveland, so my Republican brethren can not take much solace from the fact that he was appointed by a Democrat. He has been so good that they have never seen fit to remove him.

The CHAIRMAN. I met him while we were there, and he seemed like a very sensible kind of man.

Mr. BURNETT. Very sensible indeed, and a fine old gentleman, too. [Reading:]

"In a few weeks he returns, having induced some of his friends to accompany him. Immigrants of other nationalities, even the Polish Jews, spend their money where they make it, but the Sicilian and the Calabrese never. The only persons to whom their advent is a benefit are those who employ them at a cheaper figure than they would have to pay for American labor."

And, Mr. Chairman, that really seems to me to be a very fine argument, and the only argument, in favor of their coming. If you will read Mr. Bennet's report, you will find that that is his view of the Syrians. I never visited Syria; I speak especially of the south Italians, because I saw them. But the Syrian is worse, possibly, than the south Italian, according to the statements that Mr. Bennet makes, which I have no doubt—

"To at least check the constant rush of those people to our shores"—

This is what he advises—

"I see but one remedy—the insertion of the illiteracy clause in the immigration law. This would oblige about 85 per cent of the class to devote their attention to the developing of the industries of their own country, which sadly needs the aid that we are only too glad to dispense with.

"I am, sir, your obedient servant,

"CHARLES M. CAUGHY,
"American Consul."

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Burnett, pardon me. We have in Kentucky a great many people that we call Syrians. I do not know whether I am correct about the term. They go through the country, and carry their packs with them.

Mr. BURNETT. They are nearly all peddlers; yes, sir.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. They are Jews.

Mr. EDWARDS. No; they are called Syrians.

Mr. BURNETT. No, no; they are not Jews. It is a slander upon the Jewish people—I do not mean personally, of course; I mean the general opinion that the Syrians are Jews.

Mr. EDWARDS. They do not stay long enough to pay any taxes or become citizens.

Mr. BURNETT. No; they are migratory people.

Mr. EDWARDS. I never knew one of them to work a day in my life.

Mr. O'CONNELL. There are a great many of those that are what they call Armenians.

Mr. BURNETT. "Armenia" is a general term for that whole country down there. There are many Jewish people down there; but the Syrians themselves are not Jews. And I want to say right here that I have no religious feeling, gentlemen, in regard to this—no sectarian feeling—and to show that I have not I will state that only two years ago I appointed a young Jew in my own town to the Naval Academy, and when he would not accept the appointment I appointed a young German from a neighboring county, each of them in my own district. I call attention to that for the purpose of showing you and impressing upon you the fact that there is no feeling on my part against any nationality, Mr. Chairman, when they are good people and help to make good American citizens and build up our country. But my feeling—and it is not a feeling of hatred or animosity—grows out of the fact that almost every report that we get from the Northeast and the crowded cities of the East (and it is beginning to be so in the West) shows the indignities that are being perpetrated and the atrocities and the crimes that are being committed by this element, and even in my own section of the country. I say that it is time for us to call a halt; and I believe this is the conservative way of doing it. I am not here to say that every man is an undesirable citizen simply because he can not read and write. I do not believe that. But the educational test will reach those whom experience has shown to us to be, more than the people of any other nationality, undesirable citizens when they get here; and that is why I favor it.

We could not say, in terms, without causing trouble with European countries, that no persons from south Italy could come in, that no persons from Greece could come in, that no persons from Syria could come in, because that would involve us in complications that we do not want. But here is a way, Mr. Chairman, by which, while striking down hardly any of the good people of Europe, we can weed out those that are going to give trouble, and are already giving trouble, to our country.

Suppose there should be war in America. Do you believe that a single one of those Sicilians or south Italians or Greeks or Syrians would take up arms in defense of our flag? And yet the proof shows that when it came to the people of your country, and your country, and your country [addressing members of the committee] they were as valiant American soldiers as they were good American citizens. I am not here with any feeling of unkindness toward these people on account of their nationality. I say, let the good foreigner come; and he has come. One of as good counties as any in my district is a county first settled by a German colony. They are my friends, and they know my position on this question, Mr. Chairman, because I sent to them copies of the speech that I had the honor of making two years ago on the floor of this House, and in public I made the same statements that I have made here to-day. This bill is in the interest of getting more of the good immigrants.

I will not tire this committee, Mr. Chairman, with reading from that speech, showing the difference and drawing the distinction between the numbers that came from these countries before the people from the Mediterranean countries began to come in such large numbers.

Mr. HAYES. I would like to hear it. We have lots of time.

Mr. BURNETT. All right. I wanted to show you that, because I think I have demonstrated to you gentlemen that it is with no feeling of sectarianism or sectionalism, or of animosity toward any people, that I am making this argument before this committee. I believe that time will develop the fact that our brethren here among these people, who we all say are the desirable part of the country, will rally to this opinion, for the purpose of protecting the people of their own nationality and getting more of them to come.

Take, for instance, the falling off shown on pages 59 and 60 of Mr. Sargent's report on immigration to America from northwestern Europe. I will read from a speech here that I made before the Birmingham (Ala.) Board of Trade; and when I got through one of the business Germans of that city, who was my friend, came and shook my hand, and said, "You are right on this proposition."

About the time of the change that Commissioner Sargent speaks of—in 1882—there was a rapid shifting of the sources of immigration from western to eastern and southern Europe. Note the contrast (I will only use round numbers): In 1882 the total immigration to this country from all Europe and Turkey in Asia was 647,000. In 1905 it was 1,024,000. In 1907—I mean up to the end of the fiscal year, June 30—it was 1,285,349.

Of those admitted in 1882 there were 563,000 from the countries of western Europe. There were only 83,637 that year from southern and eastern Europe and Turkey in Asia. Note the difference—563,000 from the countries of northern and western Europe, and from the countries of eastern and southern Europe there were only 83,637.

Of the total immigration, 87 per cent was from northwestern Europe, and only 13 per cent from southern and eastern Europe. In 1905 there were only 216,000 from these countries of northwestern Europe, and 809,000 from the same countries of eastern and southern Europe. That is, of the total immigration 21.7 per cent was from northwestern Europe, and 78.9 per cent from eastern and southern Europe.

I will repeat those percentages in order to call them to your attention. In 1905 the immigration from northwestern Europe was only 21 per cent, and that from eastern and southern Europe was 78.9 per cent.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Of the illiterates?

Mr. BURNETT. No, sir; of the whole.

To emphasize the danger of this condition, I will contrast the immigration of a few of the countries during those two years. From Great Britain in 1882 there came 179,400. In 1905, when the total immigration had nearly doubled, it had fallen from 179,400 to 102,200. In 1882 it was nearly 28 per cent of the total immigration. In 1905 it was not quite 10 per cent. In 1882 Germany sent us 250,000; in 1905, only 37,500. In 1882 Germany sent us over 38 per cent of the entire immigration; in 1905 it sent less than 4 per cent.

Gentlemen, those figures are significant, and they must mean something.

Mr. O'CONNELL. This occurred to me, Mr. Burnett—I do not want to interrupt your remarks—

Mr. BURNETT. That is all right, Mr. O'Connell, because I believe, as I want to say here, that everyone of us wants to reach the best interests of our common country.

Mr. O'CONNELL. To be sure. This has occurred to me: We have drained northwestern Europe, to my mind, as one of the causes of the falling off. Are we not draining southeastern Europe, and are we not going to meet in a year or two years the exact falling off that we now have from the north and west?

Mr. BURNETT. Unfortunately that is not the case. There was a meeting down there while we were at Naples; and a gentleman of Calabria spoke, and he said: "While it is true that some of the villages are being depopulated, yet the Italians"—and it is the same with the Greeks and the Syrians—"are so prolific that they are coming in and filling up those places almost as fast as they are being taken out."

Mr. SABATH. There is no race suicide down there.

Mr. BURNETT. No, sir, Mr. Sabath; there is no race suicide there—none at all. In other words, they come in triplets and quadruplets and in every other way.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Speaking of race suicide, I would like to say that I recently observed a statement by one of those gentlemen who are in favor of the restriction of immigration, in which he said that the reason we have so few people raised in this country to-day is because the mothers fear the competition that their children will encounter on the part of these hated immigrants. Now, such a man as that that makes such a statement ought not to be allowed to run around loose.

Mr. O'CONNELL. That is right.

Mr. BURNETT. I have not made any such statement as that, you know. I saw the statement; but here is what the statement was based on, Mr. Chairman: As a great German has said, America is becoming the spittoon of Europe, and this writer said

that when the fathers and mothers reflected upon the fact that their children were to be laborers in competition with the laborers of southern and southeastern Europe they believed that it was better not to bring the children into the world than to have that kind of competition. I saw the same statement; it was from some minister, and that was the substance of what he said.

A little further, now, in regard to that matter. I will not repeat in regard to Germany. In 1882 Sweden sent us 64,600. Now, notice this—in 1882 Sweden sent us 64,600. Those Scandinavians have helped to build up the Northwest to a great extent, and I wish we had thousands and thousands of them in the South; I would be glad to see them. They sent us 64,600 in 1882, and in 1905, 23,300. In 1882 Sweden alone sent 10 per cent of the immigration, and in 1905 a little over 2 per cent. And that is the case, although, as I have told you, the immigration meantime has doubled.

In 1882 Italy sent 32,000; in 1905, 273,000. In 1882 it sent 5 per cent of the total; in 1905 it sent nearly 27 per cent. In 1882 Austria-Hungary sent 29,150; in 1905 it sent 265,000. In 1882 it sent 4.5 per cent; in 1905 it sent 26 per cent. In 1882 Russia sent 21,600; in 1905, 215,600. In 1882 Russia sent 3.3 per cent, in 1905, 21 per cent.

This, gentlemen, gives you a comparison of the emigration from the three principal countries of northwestern Europe with the emigration from the three principal countries of eastern and southern Europe. Within twenty-five years the emigration from northwestern Europe has fallen from 563,000 to 216,000, while that of eastern and southern Europe has increased from 83,600 to 803,800.

With regard to the German law, gentlemen, Germany does not look with favor upon these people. My friend, Mr. O'Connell, the other day made some reference in his speech in the House—a very able one—to the way that they were regarded and received over there; and yet here is an illustration from some of the Prussian laws in regard to that matter. It says:

"Tentative regulations were passed on May 6, 1892, and May 27, 1893; but the first important rule was proclaimed in a circular of the Prussian minister of the interior on October 8, 1893. It read:

"Russian emigrants are prohibited from entering the Prussian monarchy unless they possess a lawful passport, a ticket to America, and a sufficient sum of money to secure their transportation to their destination in America. Persons over 10 years of age must show 400 marks, younger persons 100 marks. The persons, however, who have steamship tickets for one of the German lines are not required to produce any cash."

Mr. Howell and I saw and talked with one of the steamship men at Breslau, and he told us that not more than a year or two before we were there the chief of police was ordered to go around and make people who had their little stands—fruit stands and other stands—leave and go back to their own country, because Germany was not encouraging an influx of that kind of immigration. Now, gentlemen, if our friends over there who are so near to them are willing to receive them during the harvest time, but as soon as the harvest time is over have them go back to their countries, then ought we, who are so much farther away and can not get them back so easily when they become undesirable or keep them out when they are undesirable, to allow them to come in such great numbers upon our people? Is it right for us to do that when those who are there and know them best are themselves afraid of many of them and restrict their ingress into their country?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. That applies only to Russians, does it not?

Mr. BURNETT. That particular rule does.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Let me tell you that there are other considerations that keep them out. You know that Germany tries to Germanize Holland, and they do not want the Russians to come in there. I know that Bismarck was very much opposed to the Russian immigration, because he did not want any more of the same class of people that there are in Poland inciting those people against the German Government. It is merely a political matter.

Mr. SABATH. And if you will pardon me, if I am not mistaken—I may not be very well posted—I think it was a measure virtually directed against the Jew of Russia. It was a special law that Germany passed or proclaimed at that time, and which, if I am not mistaken, it has since that time retracted, because of the cry that has been raised by the people all through the world of the unfairness of that proclamation or law. That has forced Germany to retract or rescind that law. If you remember, the entire world was in arms at that time against the action of the Germans.

Mr. BURNETT. The information that I got, Mr. Chairman, was that they regarded the real Russian as a worse citizen than the Jew.

Mr. HAYES. I should say, judging by the pictures Mr. Bennet displayed to us a week or two ago, that they were decidedly worse.

Mr. BURNETT. Yes, sir; they are worse. Take the Cossacks over there, the soldiers that met us at the border. At one place our passports went; at another place we were met by a soldier who shook his head when the passports were displayed, and a German gentleman who was along with us said: "They are all subject to bribery; try them with a kopec." Some gentleman in the crowd, not a commissioner, however, showed a kopec to the soldier, and he looked around toward the guardhouse, and it was evident that he thought someone saw him from the guardhouse; so he shook his head again.

I believe that the best people, the Germans themselves and the people that are bordering upon that country, will tell you that of all the Russians the best people among them are the Jews; and I believe that the Russian Jew is the best man that comes to America from Russia—that he is a better man than the real Russian. Of course, the Jews are to some extent the malcontents of that country on account of the oppressions they have suffered. But, Mr. Chairman, the Russian himself is a malcontent whenever it is to his interest to be, and a more dangerous malcontent than is the Jew.

Mr. O'CONNELL. In the figures that you read earlier in your remarks, Mr. Burnett, I believe the percentage of illiteracy from Russia is very great?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Did that include the Russian Jew?

Mr. BURNETT. To some extent; but not so much the Russian Jew as the real Russian, as I understand.

Mr. BENNET. They are a little less than 25 per cent.

Mr. BURNETT. Yes, sir. A great many of them have the Yiddish dialect, and a great many of them can read that Yiddish dialect. In the bill that we proposed at the last session the words "the English language or any other language or dialect" were included, and, as I recollect it, that was suggested mainly for the purpose of letting in those very people that could read the Yiddish dialect. I think, as Mr. Bennet has said, that less than 25 per cent, perhaps, of the Russian Jews are unable to read at least their Yiddish. Most of them can read Yiddish, if nothing else.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Excuse me, but I never heard of a dialect being read.

Mr. BURNETT. But that is a dialect over there.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I never heard of a dialect being read.

Mr. BURNETT. It hardly rises to the dignity of a language, as I understand, although I believe there are three or four millions of those people. Mr. Sabbath, perhaps, is more familiar with that matter than any of us. I believe he comes from a section where Yiddish is spoken to some extent.

Mr. SABATH. I am not especially familiar with it, but I am fairly well acquainted with it.

Mr. BENNET. I know some Yiddish myself.

Mr. SABATH. I probably know more of it than anybody here.

Mr. BENNET. The distinction, of course, is that they can not call it a language because it is not the speech of the country; but they can not call it a gibberish either, because they write literature in it, poetry, and so on. So you have got to call it a dialect.

Mr. SABATH. It is Hebrew.

Mr. BURNETT. No; it is not Hebrew.

Mr. HAYES. They use Hebrew signs.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; but the language they use is what they term Yiddish.

Mr. BENNET. It is a portion of the German language and a portion of the Russian language mixed up.

Mr. BURNETT. A kind of a combination?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. My recollection is that Senator Lodge, who is a ripe scholar and has investigated it, expressed to me the opinion that it was perhaps sixteenth-century German.

Mr. BENNET. It is old German that they were forced to learn, with some words in Hebrew. For instance, the word "magillah," I think, is a Hebrew word. The word "gonoph," I think, is a Hebrew word. The word "shool" is Hebrew, and the word "smoosch" is German, and so on.

Mr. BURNETT. Yes; it is called a dialect. It is not called a language because it is not the language of the nation, as Mr. Bennet has said.

Mr. GARDNER. Is it not called a jargon?

Mr. BENNET. Yes; it is called a jargon.

Mr. BURNETT. That is almost too undignified a term, in view of the number of people that speak that dialect.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Bijur called it a jargon, and Mr. Behar called it a jargon.

Mr. BENNET. If you strike a Jewish community and ask them if they talk the jargon they are not insulted.

Mr. SABATH. That is true.

Mr. BURNETT. On the question of the assimilation, especially the people of southern and eastern Europe, I have different ideas from what some of my friends have.

With the vast resources, varied climate, diversified industries, and products of America, I confess that we have wonderful means of assimilation. But "can the Ethiopian change his skin or the leopard his spots?"

As I have previously stated, the people against whom my principal objection is aimed are of a different race and of a different color from those of America and of northwestern Europe, and in my judgment they can never be perfectly assimilated. They may be amalgamated. History shows that wherever a superior race has been amalgamated with an inferior the superior has been pulled down and the inferior not lifted up.

We have evidence of this in some of the very people about whom I have spoken. Who can detect the courage, the intelligence, or the honor of the ancient Greek in the people who now dwell amid the ruins of that once splendid empire? Who can detect the culture and learning of the ancient Phœnician in the dirty Syrian of to-day? Who can see a trace of Cæsar's triumphant legions among the beggars of Naples as they wallow to-day in filth and grime?

Why is it that the Jew has maintained his racial distinctiveness throughout the centuries? Why is it that, no matter where he is thrown, he is generally intelligent and industrious? It is because he has always refused to amalgamate with his inferiors.

We have another illustration of the impossibility of assimilation between a superior and an inferior race in the negro of our country. To-day, with the benefits of freedom and of educational advantages before him, he is morally worse depraved than he was on the day the shackles of slavery were stricken from his limbs. And wherever there has been miscegenation the fruits have been disastrous to both races.

But, Mr. Chairman, if we concede the possibility of assimilation between the Aryan and the Iberic blood, the very increase in numbers of the inferior race makes assimilation harder and more remote. While they were few, and that few was swallowed up by the Caucasian around them, they were more apt to take to the ways of our people. But as they have grown more numerous and have banded together, forming "Little Italys," their own manners and customs and habits become more and more firmly fixed upon them. There are none of us but who deprecate the horrors of the Black Hand, and yet is there anyone who believes that these Black Hand atrocities would continue were there fewer of their own people to furnish hiding places for their criminals.

Within the past few months many of those who came from southern Europe have been returning. Many more are going back than are coming over. Why is this? It is because they have no love for America; because they have no love for our institutions; because they came to seek American gold, and not American liberty; because they have not acquired a home or erected a family hearthstone. It is because American prosperity lured them to our shores, and now American adversity is driving them away.

Gentlemen, is that the class of citizenship we desire? Are those the kind of people that you can hope to assimilate? If one little monetary flurry will drive these people from us, can we feel that they could be relied on to rally round the American flag should the horrors of war ever beset us? When they go, they carry all their belongings with them, and thus help to drain our land of the money which we need to bring us better times, and those who can not get away increase and aggravate the army of our unemployed.

Do these people soon make desirable citizens? The Liberal Immigration League does not think so. That league openly favors a law making their probation longer before they can acquire the rights of naturalized citizens.

My friend, Mr. Bennet, who is one of the ablest foes of the illiteracy test for immigrants in Congress, does not think so, because in the last Congress he was one of the most earnest advocates of the educational test for naturalization that we had among us. I think that is correct.

Mr. BENNET. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. But you know he has been in Italy since.

Mr. BENNET. I am still in favor of a rigid naturalization.

Mr. BURNETT. He helped to draft a bill in which we have an educational clause for naturalization. Immigrants must be able to read and write English was the text of the bill.

Mr. BENNET. Yes; to read and write English.

Mr. BURNETT. I believe it is an unfortunate condition for a republican government to have large numbers of male inhabitants who can not participate in its electorate, at least. We have that unfortunate condition in the South, but neither you nor I, nor this generation, is responsible for that condition.

I have not discussed this question in relation to its effect on labor; but, Mr. Chairman, I feel that to the workingman of America something is due. It is not capital alone which has made our country blossom as the rose. In fact, to my mind, capital has had a very small part in it. The honor for the prosperous conditions is mainly due to the intelligence, the industry, and the perseverance of the American workingman. Without him capital would be powerless and the hand of wealth would be paralyzed. He prostrated the forests and turned the wilderness into fallow ground. He went to the bowels of the earth and brought forth the treasures that God had hidden there.

It is useless to say that the American, the Irishman, or the German, or the Scotchman would not do this again. He has done it, and wherever the wages are adequate he will do it again. Then, gentlemen, is it fair to displace him with the pauper laborer of Europe who comes as a strike breaker or to depress the price of honest toil?

A partnership between capital and labor has brought about the splendid results that we see on every side. The laborer is the weaker partner in the protection of himself, and yet he is the stronger in the reward he brings to the whole people. Then, is that partner treated justly when capital introduces a third partner to increase its profits, and at the same time reduces the profits of the one who brings the gains to the firm?

This, gentlemen, is no empty vamping of a demagogue, but is an appeal for simple justice for those who toil. Who is asking for the low-priced, half-starved laborer from other lands? It is not the farmer. Every important farmers' association that has met for years has decried it.

The Farmers' Union of the South, an organization of more than 3,000,000 farmers, at the recent meeting in Memphis, I believe it was, or at Little Rock, unanimously passed a resolution along the line of opposition to pauper labor and immigration from the southern portions of Europe. The Cotton Growers' Association, headed by Mr. Harvey Jordan, takes exactly the same position, and but a few weeks ago the legislature of Virginia unanimously, as I understand, passed a resolution taking the same ground. The great national farmers' convention that met a year or two ago in Richmond, composed of farmers not only from the South, but from the West and from the East, passed resolutions to the same effect. The labor unions, many of them, and the Federation of Labor have done the same. The Junior Order of American Mechanics have uniformly and universally opposed this influx of labor from southern and eastern Europe.

In my judgment those who are most favoring it are the steamship companies, who in many particulars are the most lawless people who come to our country; at least in a great many respects. They do it, of course, for the fees they receive for the passage of the immigrants. The railroad companies, who receive their compensation for their distribution, and the great industrial plants of the country, who want to hold them as strike breakers, or hold them as low, cheap labor, favor this low-priced labor.

I want to say that in my section of Alabama where these people were—in reiteration of a remark I made a moment ago—as soon as the hard times began to come and the industries began to close down, these people left, those that could get away, and those that either had not accumulated enough to get away or had already sent it back to their own country are down there to-day as public charges on the charity of the people of our neighborhoods. I do not mean all, but many of them. Now when good times return, these birds of passage will all flock back again. Thousands of the steamship runners will scatter all over Europe, as we found on our visit there. Diseases are propagated, and the asylums are filled by many of these people in many communities.

Here I have a report, page 104, the annual report of the Commissioner of Immigration for 1905, in which he gives a chart and says it is shown by this chart that there are 349,885 inmates of these institutions, 252,811 of whom are native born and 97,074 foreign born. Of the foreign born, 39,646 are still aliens and 57,428 have become naturalized. Thus 11 per cent of the total number of inmates of these institutions are aliens, and 17 per cent are naturalized foreign born, making a total foreign born within the institutions 28 per cent, although of the total population of the United States but 14 per cent.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that those are the points that I desired to discuss. Mr. Bennet's argument and attitude on the naturalization bills have been so open and free that I was glad to refer to them.

Mr. BENNET. I have always distinguished between the educational test for immigrants and the educational test for naturalization, feeling in my own mind a clear distinction between the tests which enable a man who has not had previous advantages to come into this country, and those which enable a man who has had the opportunity during five years to acquire the knowledge and fitness sufficient to be admitted to citizenship. My position on the floor was frankly and openly, as Mr. Burnett says, stated when the naturalization bill was up, and I do not necessarily believe a man is

undesirable in the country because he does not know our language when he comes in, although I think he is better equipped for the duties of citizenship if he can read and write and speak our language, and I would vote that way any time on the floor.

Mr. BURNETT. That is very satisfactory. I am willing that that shall go into these remarks.

Mr. BENNET. That is my position on the floor.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Where did you get those statistics that you have referred to about the poorhouses?

Mr. BURNETT. From the report of the Commissioner-General of Immigration, Mr. Sargent.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I do not find it in my own State that way. I know many names have gone into our statistics as foreign born that are not foreign born, although their fathers and grandfathers were. Just think of a man by the name of Küstermann going into a poorhouse. They would naturally rank him, no matter how long his ancestors were in this country, as foreign born.

Mr. BURNETT. It is unthinkable that a man of that name would be there.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. He might be, just as it is set down in those statistics.

Mr. BURNETT. I take it for granted that the officials have conducted the proper investigations.

Mr. BENNET. Those are official figures.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. How do they arrive at those figures? I myself have been at the head of an institution in my State, and I know how superficial those figures are.

Mr. BURNETT. There are mistakes in statistics in a good many particulars.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. The people in the South, I suppose, object to the immigrants from any point of Europe, because you have labor enough, anyway. You have the colored gentleman, who does your work. Do you throw the Polanders in with the others?

Mr. BURNETT. They are better than the Syrians. We do not object to, but encourage emigrants from northern and northwestern Europe.

In addition to those remarks I desire also to submit a brief statement on three of the important features of the Hayes bill: First, the educational test; second, the increased head tax; and third, the requirement that an immigrant shall have at least \$25 on landing.

An educational test, I think, is the most important of all these features. It is a law, and has been found to work well, in Natal, Cape Colony, and all the Australian countries. In the first place, it is the fairest way of restricting immigration that could be instituted. One of the reasons for that statement is that it is certain. I want to quote from an address of Mr. Prescott F. Hall. He sets out that feature as strongly as possibly can be, and I do not think I could improve on his language. Speaking of the educational test, he says——

Mr. SABATH. Who is Mr. Hall?

Mr. BURNETT. He is a leading attorney and writer in Boston, Mass., and is also secretary to the executive committee of the Immigration Restriction League. The argument he makes can not be controverted by any of the gentlemen on either side. He says:

It must be a definite test, because one trouble with the "public-charge" clause of the present law, under which most exclusions now occur, is that it is so vague and elastic that it can be interpreted to suit the temper of any of the higher officials who may happen to be charged with the execution of the law. As I have elsewhere repeatedly shown, those persons who can not read in their own language are, in general, those who are also ignorant of a trade, who bring little money with them, who settle in the city slums, who have a low standard of living and little ambition to seek a better, and who do not assimilate rapidly or appreciate our institutions. It is not claimed that an illiteracy test is a test of moral character, but it would undoubtedly exclude a good many persons who now fill our prisons and almshouses and would lessen the burden upon our schools and machinery of justice.

Mr. SABATH. You refer there to the criminality. I have here in my hand the report of the Census Bureau which shows——

Mr. BURNETT. What year?

Mr. SABATH. 1904, the last one published, which shows that Mr. Hall's statement is not exactly correct, because the criminal class of the immigrant is much smaller in proportion to the population than the native born, namely, the percentage of immigrants is 23 per cent, whereas the percentage of the prisoners is only 16 per cent.

Mr. BURNETT. You misunderstood the language that Mr. Hall used; he did not say the majority of them, but he says a good many persons. I think that every well-informed American at least will admit that of all the aliens coming to this country the south Italian, the Syrian, and the people of eastern Europe are the least desirable; and yet they are the ones who are coming in largest numbers. In that connection I want to read the last report of the Commissioner of Immigration, the report of 1909, on page 111.

Mr. SABATH. Commissioner Keefe, Chief of the Bureau of Immigration?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes. I want to say in that connection that Commissioner Keefe is certainly entitled to a great deal of respect as to his opinions. He has been a man who has been closely affiliated with the labor organizations of the country, and has come in contact frequently with this very class of people.

Mr. SABATH. His leadership has been disputed by Mr. Gompers; over a year ago Mr. Gompers did not agree with him on a great many questions.

Mr. HAYES. On this one, of immigration, he agrees with him.

Mr. BURNETT. Yes; absolutely. He says:

■ The peasants of the countries mentioned have for a number of years supplied a rich harvest to the promoter of immigration. The promoter is usually a steamship ticket agent, employed on a commission basis, or a professional money lender, or a combination of the two. His only interest is the wholly selfish one of gaining his commission and collecting his usury. He is employed by the steamship lines, large and small, without scruple, and to the enormous profit of such lines. The more aliens they bring over the more there are to be carried back if failure meets the tentative immigrant and the more are likely to follow later if success is his lot. Whatever the income, it is a good commercial proposition for the steamship line. To say that the steamship lines are responsible, directly or indirectly, for this unnatural immigration is not the statement of a theory, but of a fact, and of a fact that sometimes becomes, indeed, if it is not always, a crying shame.

And, quoting from Inspector Gruenberg:

He shows quite clearly that all of the steamship lines engaged in bringing aliens from Europe to this country have persistently and systematically violated the law, both in its letter and spirit, by making use of every possible means to encourage the peasants of Europe to purchase tickets over their lines to this country. They have issued circulars and advertisements, and made use of extensive correspondence, through their own agents in this country and in Europe, and of private correspondents, some of it spurious in character, to impress the peasants with the belief that employment at high wages could be promptly secured on landing in the United States. Some of them have joined hands with money lenders and other sharks for the purpose of exploiting the prospective passengers, providing them with passage under a credit system which amounted almost to robbery, and insuring themselves against loss by taking mortgages and joint notes.

Mr. SABATH. Will you permit me right here to ask a question? Now, we have a law which prohibits steamship companies from doing this very thing——

Mr. HAYES. They are doing it all the time.

Mr. SABATH. Why is it that the Commissioner of Immigration and his deputy, whose name you have given here, do not stop that abuse and prosecute the offenders?

Mr. BURNETT. We have no control of them on the other side, nor of their agents; we can only prevent their landing those who are thus induced to come, and the great trouble, no doubt, would be, in the administration of that—finding out what is going on on the other side.

Mr. HAYES. Picking out the individual cases, that is the trouble; you can not make any wholesale investigation; you have to investigate each individual case.

Mr. SABATH. If we could obtain any evidence against the steamship companies guilty of this violation, could we not punish them in other ways?

Mr. HAYES. How can you if something happens outside of our jurisdiction?

Mr. SABATH. But we have jurisdiction over them to this extent, that we have the right to pass laws pertaining to the regulation of steerage passengers, and in that way we could enforce the law.

Mr. BURNETT. While we know these things go on on the other side, it would be difficult to find a specific case on which to base a prosecution, even if the law permitted us to do it.

Mr. SABATH. What evidence have they submitted to this committee that these violations do take place?

Mr. BURNETT. Here is the official report of Gruenberg, a man who went there and investigated it, spent several months in Europe in conducting a quiet, deep investigation for the Government, and Mr. Keefe, in his report, quotes from the report made by Mr. Gruenberg, as follows:

The record and the exhibits are well worth reading, and, it is believed, are absolutely convincing that the steamship companies, in their eagerness to successfully compete with one another, have made no effort to control their agents and subagents, or to keep them within the limits of the United States immigration law, but have rather encouraged than discouraged their unlawful practices in inducing an artificial immigration.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, the Black Hand does not compare with the steamship lines. The steamship lines that are coming to this country are to-day doing more harm to the country than the Black Hand themselves are doing. They are worse, more lawless, than the Black Hand.

I desire to show the percentage of the undesirable class of people from the last report (1909) of the Commissioner-General of Immigration, from which I have just quoted.

A large proportion of immigration during the past year, as for a number of years previously, has had its source in southern and eastern Europe. Countries of that section furnished about 67 per cent of the total immigration; Italy, 183,218, or over 24 per cent; Austria-Hungary, 170,191, or about 23 per cent; Greece, 14,111, or nearly 2 per cent; Turkey and the small principalities surrounding, 11,659, or about 1½ per cent; and Russia, 120,460, or about 16 per cent.

This is not a natural, but a stimulated immigration, and as I have just called attention to, from the report of Mr. Gruenberg, stimulated by the lawless action of the steamship companies on the other side that we can hardly reach at all.

Mr. SABATH. Isn't there any possible way of reaching the steamship companies?

Mr. BURNETT. The only way, the sure way, is to stop that class of immigration, in my judgment.

Mr. SABATH. I am in favor of stopping the steamship companies from doing just what you claim they are guilty of—that of stimulating immigration, but I am, of course, in favor of permitting all those who are fleeing from persecution and from the unbearable conditions in their own countries, to come to this country.

Mr. BURNETT. You do not think that the south Italian is fleeing from religious persecution, do you?

Mr. SABATH. Well, they come, they are fleeing from the existing conditions.

Mr. BURNETT. They generally bring their priests along with them.

Mr. SABATH. Well, that is to their credit—it is not to their discredit, I am sure.

Mr. BURNETT. Well, I do not object to it; but it shows that they are not fleeing from any religious conditions that they object to.

Mr. SABATH. No, but economical conditions.

Mr. BURNETT. And the illiteracy or educational test would shut out a large percentage of that very class of stimulated immigration; and in the statement that I previously made before the committee, and that I have had leave to file as part of these remarks, I called attention to the percentage of the different localities and countries, while, on the other hand, the immigration that is really of the desirable class, that from northwestern Europe, would scarcely be touched at all by the illiteracy test.

Mr. SABATH. Well, we are not receiving a large percentage of that immigration from the northern states, because they need all the labor they can possibly obtain right at home.

Mr. BURNETT. And Mr. Keefe, in this very report, says that if we shut out the undesirable class we will get more of the good. The point being that if the steamships can not fill their steerage with illiterates they will bring literates.

Mr. SABATH. I disagree with Mr. Keefe.

Mr. BURNETT. No doubt.

Mr. SABATH. I know that Germany is more than anxious to receive all those that Mr. Keefe claims to be undesirable; they are clamoring for labor all the time in Germany.

Mr. BURNETT. In that connection I want to quote, on that very point, and on another, from the Commissioner of Immigration at New York. In his last annual report (1909) he says:

Few people are bold enough to claim that we are in urgent need of any more immigrants who will crowd into the congested districts of our large cities. And yet this is where a large percentage of our immigrants now go and stay. At a time when portions of the West are crying for out-of-door labor the congestion in New York City may be increasing at the rate of many thousands per month.

Mr. SABATH. Then he should be in favor of the distribution law, and yet we find he is opposed to it.

Mr. BURNETT. No; not opposed to it.

Mr. SABATH. Who, Mr. Keefe, the Commissioner-General of Immigration?

Mr. BURNETT. No; he recommends the continuance of the distribution bureau, as I understand it.

Mr. SABATH. I have information that leads me to say that he is not in favor of the distribution bureau.

Mr. BURNETT. I want to state in that connection that I am opposed to it.

Mr. SABATH. If his report is true, then he should be in favor of it; if the people in the country are clamoring for labor and can not obtain it why shouldn't we assist in distributing immigration to the sections where they really do need labor?

Mr. BURNETT. Because that class of people won't work in agricultural sections, and if they need them they can not use them because they are of no account for farm labor. To distribute from the congested ports not only makes room for more to be brought in, but tends through the vacuum created to draw more in. I believe it was President Roosevelt who described distribution as a mere palliative. Any way, very few of our present-day immigrants are real farmers or want to till the soil.

Mr. SABATH. You, and everyone else who makes that statement, are mistaken, because the majority of these people come from the rural districts and from the farms of Europe, and they are excellent agriculturists; and if you take the Western States, one by one, you will find that in the majority of those States the work is being done by the foreign element.

Mr. BURNETT. They live in the towns in their home countries and walk 3 or 4 miles into the country to work, which is absolutely impracticable in this country. They do not live on the land they cultivate, but in congested centers.

Mr. SABATH. Oh, no.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Not impracticable in this country when you consider the fact that we have rapid transportation now between the city and the country. For instance, in Boston you can get away out into the country, where the farms are, in a very short time.

Mr. BURNETT. As a matter of fact, how many live in the towns and make use of those transportation facilities in working out in the country?

Mr. O'CONNELL. If you were to get on the early cars in the morning you would believe they were all going out there.

Mr. SABATH. There is no one else you will find working out in the country, and on our railroads, than this very immigrant that you object to.

Mr. BURNETT. They work on the railroads because they pay them so little that the American and northwestern European won't stay there; if they were not here, they would pay decent wages to our own workmen and they would work there. Americans and northwest Europeans used to do all that kind of work. Northwest Europe and Great Britain, with the exception of Ireland, are now more densely populated and some of the countries have more unemployed than ever before.

Mr. SABATH. If they were not here, you could not find enough labor to do that kind of work; and because they do come here they really help the American laboring man in securing better positions, because it is then that they do the hard work and the American laboring man is advanced.

Mr. BURNETT. When I conclude this quotation, I will read you from an eminent authority on that question in New York City. I think he knows probably more about it than you or I.

Another way of putting this is to say that much of our present-day immigration is not responsive to the legitimate demands for additional labor in the United States. I think this fact should be made known throughout those sections of our country where many erroneously think that further restrictions of the right kind would increase the difficulties incident to obtaining labor for which there is a real demand. Quite the contrary is the case, for poor immigration tends to deter good immigrants from coming.

Now, the authority I spoke of a moment ago, as to where they go, is that of Dr. Thomas Darlington, president of the board of health of New York City. He says:

I have heard the assertion that immigration is necessary to carry on our public works, to build railroads, dig canals, and the like. But the present immigrants now coming over do not come for that purpose, and will not do that sort of work.

Mr. SABATH. What work do they do?

Mr. BURNETT. He tells you:

No; they prefer to become push-cart peddlers and live in poverty in our cities, breeding disease and crime. They occupy our streets, the streets for which our taxpayers have paid heavily. They interfere with traffic and break the laws of sanitation which we have decided were necessary for the preservation of public health.

Mr. SABATH. I want to say that a mighty small percentage of those people are push-cart peddlers.

Mr. O'CONNELL. If you were to look in the trenches, in the factories, in the shops, and so forth, and see them working there, it would be pretty hard to reconcile Doctor Darlington's description of them.

Mr. BURNETT. I am sorry to find that all of these authorities, who have such splendid means of knowing what they are talking about, are disputed by you gentlemen.

Mr. SABATH. How do you make Doctor Darlington an authority on it? I think I am a better authority than he is. I think I have had better opportunities of observation.

Mr. BURNETT. Are you a better authority than Doctor Darlington as to New York City?

Mr. SABATH. Well, I am in the city of Chicago, the greatest city in the world. I have lived in that section of the city where we receive large immigration from these very countries that you have mentioned. I know the people of the city of Chicago do not object to them coming to our city; they have helped to build our city, and you will find them working everywhere, performing the hardest work.

Mr. BURNETT. Another reason why this is a fair test is because no nation could complain of it. If we were to say that no Italian, no Greek or Syrian, should come, of course we would have international complications, but no nation can say that we have not the right to demand a higher standard of education for those that come to this country.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Has this feature ever occurred to you? Have you taken up the question on this line? That in cases, such as took place in Ireland, where education was a crime, where——

Mr. HAYES. In Ireland, education a crime?

Mr. O'CONNELL. It was; yes.

Mr. HAYES. Not in our day.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes; in our day.

Mr. HAYES. Well, practically all Irishmen can read.

Mr. O'CONNELL. There was a day, not so long past, when it was practically a crime, and a man could not be educated.

Mr. BURNETT. Under the English statutes?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes; unless they were educated in the English schools, in a way that some people prescribed for them. Now, suppose that situation was existing in some country to-day which existed in Ireland, a country which has sent to this country the most desirable kind of immigration; what would you say would be the result if you were to apply your educational test among men and women coming to this country who could neither read nor write?

Mr. HAYES. We are not legislating for a hundred years ago.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Suppose that situation existed to-day? Isn't that practically the situation with the Russian Jew to-day? Isn't he kept down by the Government so that education is almost impossible?

Mr. HAYES. They can all read.

Mr. BURNETT. One of the gentlemen representing the Russian Jews said that there were very few of the heads of families in Russia who could not read.

Mr. SABATH. But another one stated it might amount to 15 per cent.

Mr. HAYES. It is less than 2.

Mr. O'CONNELL. I thought it was something like 30.

Mr. HAYES. No; that would include the women and children.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Does your bill relate only to the heads of families?

Mr. HAYES. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNELL. I think that is going altogether too far.

Mr. BURNETT. The idea was not to cause the separation of families where the man, who is the responsible head, can almost always meet those conditions. And in that connection I desire to quote another very eminent authority. President Roosevelt in his message of December 3, 1901, following President McKinley's lead, said:

The second object of a proper immigration law ought to be to secure by a careful and not merely perfunctory educational test some intelligent capacity to appreciate American institutions and act sanely as American citizens.

I want to say here that a different condition prevails among the people who are the illiterates mentioned here and the condition in Ireland. While they were an oppressed people, yet they had the same love of liberty and of popular government that they have now, the same as our own people and our ancestors had, and they were very different people altogether from those now coming from southern Europe and western Asia.

Mr. SABATH. The same thing applies to the great majority of those people who are coming here to-day.

Mr. BURNETT. How can that be when they show over there they had little appreciation of liberty or the conditions would not have so long remained as they are? The form of government and lack of public schools reflects the character of the people. The Irish themselves have been gradually correcting the political conditions in their country on account of their splendid intelligence.

Mr. SABATH. The Slovenians, the Poles, and the Roumanians are doing the very thing the Irish are doing, but I regret to say they have not the amount of energy that the Irish have, but the fight has been a bitter one for the last hundred years; and if you will read the history of Poland, read the history of the Slovenian people, and the history of Bohemia you will learn that they have been at all times fighting to secure as much liberty as they possibly could, and fighting for the privilege and the right of education.

Mr. BURNETT. I will read further from President Roosevelt's message:

This would not keep out all anarchists, for many of them belong to the intelligent criminal classes. But it would do what is also in point—that is, tend to decrease the sum of ignorance so potent in producing the envy, suspicion, malignant passion and hatred of order, out of which anarchistic sentiment mentally springs. Finally, all persons should be excluded who are below a certain standard of economic fitness to enter our industrial field as competitors with American labor. There should be proper proof of personal capacity to earn an American living and enough money to insure a decent start under American conditions. This would stop the influx of cheap labor, and the resulting competition which gives rise to so much bitterness in American industrial life; and it would dry up the spring of the pestilential social conditions in our great cities where anarchistic organizations have their greatest possibility of growth. Both the educational and economic test in a wise immigration law should be designed to protect and elevate the great body politic and social. A very close supervision should be exercised over the steamship companies which mainly bring over the immigrant, and they should be held to a strict accountability for any infraction of the law.

Mr. SABATH. What do you read from?

Mr. BURNETT. President Roosevelt's message, and later ones, I believe, that of 1905, for instance—I have it here somewhere—reiterated substantially the same thing.

Mr. HAYES. He did not go over the whole ground in 1905, but substantially reiterated what you have read.

Mr. BURNETT. He insisted upon the educational test.

Mr. SABATH. That is not the only instance where a President has sent a message without giving the subject due consideration.

Mr. BURNETT. I quote that, not so much because it is a message from the President of the United States, but because of the argument, which, I think, is unanswerable, and the reason he gives for it.

Now, there is another reason for that. The countries themselves and the people themselves would at once go to work for the purpose of educating their people in order to make them meet such requirements, especially countries like Italy. Do not tell me Italy does not want to send its people, because it does; it encourages them to come, and it is from southern Italy that the greatest influx of illiterates is coming. The immigration from north Italy is small. They would at once go to work remedying that very condition and send us people who were, at least, more literate than those we are now getting, and on the average far better fitted for our citizenship, our industrial and social conditions.

Mr. SABATH. I admit I do not know the conditions that prevail in Italy as well as I do the conditions that prevail in Austria-Hungary and the Slovenian countries, but I can assure you, sir, that all those countries are doing everything, rather the people residing in those countries, to secure themselves the education they think is needed; in fact, the majority of the schools maintained in these countries are maintained by the private subscriptions of these people and these races.

Mr. BURNETT. While it might be true that some of the countries would not encourage the education of its people in order that they might come to this country, it would encourage individual initiative, and they themselves, the individuals and their families, would exercise great care and diligence in securing at least the ability to read their own language or dialect or some other language of Europe, as the Hayes bill provides.

In regard to crime, I want to quote from another very distinguished authority, a man who had an opportunity to see that the rest of us did not have, and that is Gen. Theodore A. Bingham, former police commissioner of New York City. He said, in an interview published in the Cincinnati Enquirer and elsewhere, on July 20, 1907——

Mr. SABATH. He has taken back what he said at that time.

Mr. BURNETT. No; I never understood that he did, because he said this when he was right in the midst of the Dyker Heights crimes. I would like to see it if you have his retraction; I will give you leave to insert it in the record if you find he has ever made such a retraction. He said:

There is another very important thing about this crime business. I don't want to say anything that would be indiscreet, but unquestionably the hordes of immigrants that are coming here have a good deal to do with crimes against women and children. You will notice that these particular crimes are done by fellows who can not talk the English language. It is this wave of immigration that brings to New York the hundreds of thousands of criminals who don't know what liberty means, and don't care; don't know our customs, can not speak the English language, and are in general the scum of Europe. The solution of the problem is to prohibit immigration. But when we come to executing immigration laws it is found to be practically impossible to deport.

And that is true. We have found it is almost impossible to get rid of these fellows after they get here.

The statement was made the other day by Mr. Keliher that this movement was inaugurated by the propaganda that he referred to as the Junior Order of American Mechanics. In answer to that, we have had before us also representatives of the farmers' unions of the South and West, consisting of three millions of members; we have had before us representatives of the American Federation of Labor, representatives of the Railway Trainmen's organizations, and others. The resolutions that have been passed by these various organizations have not just jumped up; they have been before their organizations for years and years, and the resolutions have each year been passed. Now, if it be true, as was asserted by Mr. Keliher before this committee, that this was the result of that propaganda alone, certainly during all of this time, with the investigation of these intelligent American workmen—and when I say American I mean both native born and foreign born—there would have been some dissent from those resolutions and they would have come to this committee and to Congress long before this, and would have had considerable weight. Then, too, there are resolutions of state legislatures, boards of charities, leagues, and other bodies. Now, on the other hand——

Mr. SABATH. How do you know there is not a difference in the organizations?

Mr. BURNETT. The very fact that no dissent has ever been brought to this committee, when it has on it such watchful and careful gentlemen as the gentleman from Chicago, Mr. Sabath, and if it had been he certainly would have found it and filed it long before this.

Mr. SABATH. I did not desire to impose upon the committee by filing all the resolutions and objections I have received from various organizations and societies against these bills.

Mr. HAYES. I could make up a book of a hundred pages with letters I have received in favor of the illiteracy test.

Mr. SABATH. And I could bring thousands of letters and resolutions against it that I have received in the last few days.

Mr. BURNETT. Not originating with these important organizations which have presented their protests here.

I want to quote from Mr. John Mitchell, who is one of the leaders of organized labor, from an article he wrote for the Outlook last August, entitled "Protect the workman:"

It is only necessary to visit the mining districts of the eastern and central Western States, the mill towns, and the centers of the textile industry to find these erstwhile European farm laborers—

The farm laborers that the gentleman referred to a while ago—

They have been colonized, and because of the large numbers who are congregated together the opportunity for or the possibility of their assimilation is greatly minimized. The temptation to establish and perpetuate the customs and standards of their own countries, instead of adopting the standards of our country, is so great that if the system of colonization continues it will take several generations to amalgamate these trades and blend them into an American people. This condition is not best for them; neither is it good for us; it is simply the result of an unregulated immigration and an unwise distribution of aliens.

We all know that where these people are congregated in large numbers there is less inclination to learn or to adapt themselves to American conditions and the greater inclination to perpetuate the conditions that they had in their own countries.

Mr. O'CONNELL. You wouldn't think so in the cities of Massachusetts if you had to go into those cities and have business with those people in all kinds of business. I do not limit it to any one form. It only takes them a very short time before they are dealing with you on American ideals and American standards; they will adopt American customs in very quick order. I can not understand why such a statement as that should be made in view of the facts I find absolutely to the contrary.

Mr. SABATH. I have all the confidence in the world in Mr. Mitchell, but on this point I think Mr. Mitchell is wrong; he contradicts himself. He says that it is an uneven distribution, and still I find that he is opposed to a system whereby we could remedy that wrong and bring about a better distribution of the immigration.

Mr. BURNETT. But it is my opinion, and it is his idea, that even if there was a better distribution it would not ameliorate the conditions, because it would be a distribution of people who are, even when distributed, still undesirable.

Mr. SABATH. Well, has he or have you heard any objections against immigration from the sections of the country where the immigration goes?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. Isn't it a fact that these objections are always raised in a section of the country where they have no immigration?

Mr. BURNETT. In reply to that I have the best authority for the statement that there is very strong sentiment against it in Massachusetts, and against it in Boston.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Against what?

Mr. BURNETT. In favor of the restriction of immigration, and that statement is based on the fact that Senator Lodge was the author of the educational test in the Senate bill that passed the Senate, and the fact that Mr. Gardner, also representing a Massachusetts district, is one of the strongest advocates of an educational test that there is among

us; and certainly those gentlemen, coming from that State, must know something about conditions there and reflect the sentiment of the people they represent. And not only that, but in my own section, where a number of these immigrants have gone in recent years, the protest comes in from both the cities and from the country. And the gentlemen suggests that these protests come from those who do not come in contact with these people, and yet here is John Mitchell, ex-president of and still active in the miners' unions, who travels all over the country, who, perhaps, sees more people and more workmen in a day than any Member of Congress will see in a year's service, saying this:

To that end wage-earners believe: First. That, in addition to the restrictions imposed by the laws at present in force, the head tax of \$4 now collected should be increased to \$10.

And that is my bill; I am not an extremist on the question of a head tax, but I do believe that it ought to be at least increased to \$10; I do not remember whether Mr. Hayes's bill provides for a head tax of \$10 or \$25.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Hayes's bill provides for a head tax of \$10.

Mr. BURNETT. Then, further reading from this Mr. Mitchell pamphlet:

Second. That each immigrant, unless he be a political refugee, should bring with him not less than \$25, in addition to the amount required to pay transportation to the point where he expects to find employment. Third. That immigrants between the ages of 14 and 50 years should be able to read a section of the Constitution of the United States, either in our language, in their own language, or in the language of the country from which they come.

Now, Mr. Chairman, are not those the views of the men who are in those organizations? I think so. And I want to say that even the railroad interests of the South that have heretofore been so tenaciously hanging on to the idea of indiscriminate immigration, mainly for the purpose of collecting the fees of transportation and developing traffic, in my judgment, are themselves modifying their views in regard to that, and I quote now from an address delivered by Mr. W. W. Finley, the president of the Southern Railway Company, before the Tulane University, in Louisiana, recently, in which he says:

I do not take the position, Mr. President, that we should discourage immigration into the South; but I believe that, as far as possible, we should draw our immigrants in the first instance from other parts of our own country and from among those of foreign birth who have already assimilated American ideals in other sections, and that we should seek to avoid any situation that would impose upon us the difficult task of assimilating all at once a large foreign element.

Mr. SABATH. So that he is in favor of foreign-born citizens.

Mr. BURNETT. So we all are, if he is the right kind of a citizen; that is, I say we all are, I am, and I think every member of this committee is. Now, in that same connection I want to quote from an editorial in the August, 1908, issue of the Textile World Record, a large monthly magazine published at Boston and New York, in the interest of textile manufacturers, and which says:

In his paper read before the cotton congress at Paris last June, 1908, D. A. Tompkins, of Charlotte, N. C., told the European manufacturers plainly what was and is the only way to increase adequately the world's cotton supply, developing cotton growing in the Southern States. Mr. Tompkins also pointed out the chief requirement for such development, an increase in the labor supply, and advised the European manufacturers to do what they could to divert European emigrants to the cotton belt.

While Mr. Tompkins's position is right, it must not be forgotten that the remedy is one to be applied with the greatest care and only after the most thorough investigation. Better that the American cotton crop shall remain stationary forever than that its increase should be accompanied by the creation or aggravation of race issues in this country. The remedy might easily prove worse than the disease. For this reason it should not be applied promiscuously by getting European manufacturers to promote the emigration of the offscourings of Europe to the South in order that they (the manufacturers) may receive more American cotton to be made into goods for the natives of Asia and Africa. It should be applied only after careful investigation and with the approval of the people of the South. They have the right to exercise a controlling influence in this matter, with the object of developing the resources of the country by immigration of those who will become part of the white race now there.

The editor quotes a letter from the secretary of the Alabama Commercial and Industrial Association, several paragraphs of which I beg to call to your attention:

There has been a considerable accession of Greeks in and around Mobile during the past two or three years, but the results from the point of view of land development were not satisfactory, and they are now clustered in the cities, running restaurants, fruit stands, and vieing with the negro in shining shoes.

In the northern part of the State, which you will understand has practically the same problem of development as Pennsylvania, owing to its iron and coal mines, there has been a considerable accession in the past few years from the Slav races. They have not pleased, though they have done the required work, for their ideals of citizenship are very slightly developed, and their sense of obligation to the State is curiously lacking. At the first breath of hard times they scuttle in every direction, thoroughly disgusting all those who had been endeavoring to foster immigration along that line. Just what you suggest in relation to the difficulty of assimilation experienced in Louisiana with the Italians would be duplicated here, I am sure.

Of similar import is an editorial in the last issue of the Manufacturers' Record, published at Baltimore, which has very much modified its views in that regard, and which I want to quote. It says in an editorial of March 10:

The National Liberal Immigration League, of New York City, is beginning to issue "a monthly magazine to be devoted in an open-minded and educational way to the various phases of immigration and kindred subjects." The circular announces that among the purposes of the league are opposition to further restriction of immigration and ample provision for the distribution of immigrants, "who should be especially directed to the South and West." Therefore the National Liberal Immigration League ought not to receive the support of the country. The Manufacturers' Record doubts not that the majority of the men whose names are carried upon the promotive literature of the league are sincere in their belief that it may accomplish something for the benefit of the country. The conviction of the Manufacturers' Record is to the contrary. How any organization housed in New York, the center of daily manifestations of evils inherent in immigration that should be no further restricted, in the opinion of the league, can soberly expect the intelligence of the country to cooperate with it in scattering the evils passes understanding, for the league announces that "in order to diminish the evils of congestion free transportation should be granted from overcrowded regions to places where there is a demand for labor."

As a matter of fact, the league loomed into prominence at the time when the evils of the kind of immigration the country was receiving stirred the country to efforts for further restriction, and the league was naturally regarded as antagonistic to further restriction, as it now acknowledges itself to be. Moreover, quite prominent in the organization were representatives of a movement patronized by alien racial and ecclesiastical influences which for a number of years had been attempting to use the South as a field for their wholesale colonization schemes. * * * One of the evils of latter-day immigration is this very effort to blind the eyes of the people of this country to the purpose, of foreign origin, of colonizing the South with aliens. Success of the schemes could result only in building up other centers of congestion of undesirables, intensifying the social, religious, and political menaces now rankly flourishing in New York. It is true that immigration is desirable, provided that it is the right kind of immigration. There was a "stream of human brawn, energy, and mentality" from abroad up to 1880 or 1890 of distinct value to the United States. It was valuable

because it was largely of the stocks dominating in the history of the country, but about the beginning of the present century the character of immigration changed radically, and since then the dominant elements in the swelling flood have been composed largely of persons unfit for admission to this country.

Mr. SABATH. Well, again I disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. BURNETT. Certainly.

Mr. SABATH. I do not see how he can justly criticise the Liberal Immigration League when he himself is a resident of that—is that a New York publication?

Mr. BURNETT. No; a Baltimore publication.

Mr. SABATH. Baltimore is a large city, but I doubt very much whether he has a better opportunity to judge than the Liberal Immigration League has.

Mr. BURNETT. And in the February number of last year the same journal says:

It must be confessed that these southern immigration schemes and other sociological, educational, and economic movements engineered from New York disregard the fact of the South's forty years' fight for the maintenance of white civilization. It must be confessed that if the diverse schemes succeed, white civilization must pass from a portion of the South. What care the schemers for that, and what care they for the disinterested warnings as long as the public mind of the South can be diverted from the fundamental questions?

Mr. O'CONNELL. What does he mean by that? That white immigration to the South is going to interfere with white domination?

Mr. BURNETT. It would bring on a second race issue in my country, Mr. O'Connell, to bring in large numbers of the southern and eastern Europeans and west Asiatics.

Mr. O'CONNELL. A second race issue?

Mr. BURNETT. The south Italian is not a white man, the Syrian is not a white man, and they are not so regarded. The negro in my country respects the Caucasian, the white man, and is gradually more and more yielding to that control, but he has no respect for the man that he denominates a "dago." Still, while it may not raise an issue between the white man and the southern European, I believe that if it continues long enough there will be a race issue between the southern European and the negro himself, and perhaps between the white man and the south Italian also.

Mr. SABATH. Will you pardon me, Mr. Burnett? I am not now in possession of the statistics showing the immigration to the South, but I am of the opinion——

Mr. BURNETT. Of what?

Mr. SABATH. Of the immigration to the South; but I am of the opinion that it has been very small; the fact is I do not think the entire immigration to the South has amounted to more than a few thousand, all in all, in the last three or four years.

Mr. BURNETT. You are mistaken about that.

Mr. SABATH. Have you the report?

Mr. BURNETT. Fortunately for us it has not been very great throughout the South generally, so far as the south Italian is concerned.

Mr. SABATH. I think it is unfortunate for you.

Mr. O'CONNELL. I do too.

Mr. SABATH. Because if you were to receive the white immigrants I venture to say your lands that are now being sold for two and three dollars an acre would at once become worth twice as much, three

times and even ten times as valuable as they are now. I remember myself that lands selling for two, three, and four dollars an acre twenty years ago have on account of immigration increased in value up to \$50 and \$100 an acre. You take the States of Wisconsin, Nebraska, both the Dakotas, Minnesota, and even certain sections in Illinois, and certain sections in Kansas and Iowa, and other sections all through the West, and I can remember when I could have obtained land there, before immigration started, at two and three dollars an acre, and to-day that very land is worth from \$25 to \$100 an acre.

Mr. HAYES. Do you think that is an advantage to the United States to have its lands away up like that and all taken up and cultivated?

Mr. SABATH. The people of the United States are benefited.

Mr. HAYES. I do not see it; because it is to their advantage to have cheap land; if the land is high it makes the food dear.

Mr. SABATH. If you cultivate more land it will not make food dearer, it will make it cheaper.

Mr. HAYES. In the West, in those States that you have mentioned, the cheap land is gone and there are no public lands.

Mr. BURNETT. And 90,000 young men are going to Canada every year. In the greater portion of the South we no longer have cheap lands.

Mr. SABATH. May I ask you a question? If all that were true, and those lands were not cultivated, could we export millions and millions of bushels of wheat every year?

Mr. HAYES. We are not exporting much now.

Mr. SABATH. You are mistaken; we are.

Mr. BURNETT. The complete answer to that is that it was a different class of immigration that built up the Northwest, different from those now coming in. Conditions have changed just as they have with regard to our forests. Conservation is the cry now and not complete exploitation.

Mr. SABATH. And the same objections were raised against that immigration then that is now being raised against those now coming in.

Mr. BURNETT. Not to that extent, or some means would have been secured to stop it. In regard to the immigration to the South, there is a section in and around Birmingham—the section in which I live—sections in Texas, and other parts of the South where many undesirable immigrants have gone. True, there is a German county in my district, and those Germans are fine men, fine farmers, and good citizens. We welcome that class of people. But the class that is pulling down the civilization of the country is not increasing the price of lands nor making more productive the farms in that country. So far as the price of lands is concerned, there are no cheap lands in Alabama now, and the price has not been increased by the influx of the south Italian, the Greek, or the Syrian.

Mr. SABATH. Isn't the land in the county where the Germans have settled worth more than the land in the county south of it?

Mr. BURNETT. Well, the county south of it does not belong to my district—it is a mineral county—but the county east of it is of the same character of county.

Mr. SABATH. I have heard you say many times that you thought a great deal of those people—those Germans that resided in your district?

Mr. BURNETT. I do.

Mr. SABATH. And you have also stated that they are as fine a class of people as one would wish to have.

Mr. BURNETT. And I reiterate that statement. The lands in that county are now as valuable as any farm lands in my district, due to a great extent to those Germans and others who came in there, but that is a class of people which would not be excluded by Mr. Hayes's educational test.

Mr. O'CONNELL. What about the places where the Italians have gone? Hasn't the land grown in value in those places also and haven't the people prospered?

Mr. BURNETT. There are not a dozen south Italian farmers in that section of the South; they do not go to farming.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Take it in those places where they have gone into business and not into farming; has not the community increased in wealth and has it not grown more prosperous than before these men came there?

Mr. BURNETT. The community increased in wealth in spite of that fact. One coal operator told me he had, to a large extent, discharged his Italian laborers and gone back to using negro labor because he said the negro was a better laborer, though not as steady; and another operator told me that while he employed Italians he would prefer to have negroes, but was compelled to keep the Italians in order to regulate the price of the labor.

My time is about up, and I would like to refer to a few other propositions in the five or ten minutes that remain.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now 5 minutes of 12.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I have discussed the illiteracy test because, as I said, I think it the most important, but I believe the head tax ought to be increased to \$10.

Mr. SABATH. You do not agree with Mr. Elvins, whose bill provides for a hundred dollars as a head tax?

Mr. BURNETT. I do not want a prohibitory tax, and that might have that effect, to some extent. A distinguished lawyer, who spoke the other day, said that the head tax would probably be unconstitutional because it was in violation of the section of the Constitution putting a limitation upon the taxing power. He referred to the case in *Head Money*, 112 United States, in which the Supreme Court of the United States said:

That these statutes are regulations of commerce—of commerce with foreign nations—is conceded in the argument in this case; and that they constitute a regulation of that class which belongs exclusively to Congress is held in all the cases in this court.

It is upon these propositions that the court has decided in all these cases that the state laws are void. Let us examine those decisions for a moment.

I desired to refer to all of these cases, but I will just read the conclusion of the one cited:

It is enough to say that, Congress having the power to pass a law regulating immigration as a part of commerce of this country with foreign nations, we see nothing in the statute by which it has here exercised that power, forbidden by any other part of the Constitution.

I think it is absolutely conclusive, under the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, that we have the right to do that, and that part of the argument as to unconstitutionality falls to the ground.

In regard to whether it is fair and just or not. A majority of these people that come are of the undesirable class, and, while they may be wealth makers, to a very limited extent, they are not taxpayers, either to the National Government or to the state government to any great extent.

Mr. O'CONNELL. But they must pay something by reason of our system of indirect taxation.

Mr. SABATH. There I disagree with you again, Mr. Burnett; they are paying their share of our taxes.

Mr. BURNETT. Well, that is my proposition and, of course—I insist——

Mr. SABATH. Where do we derive our revenue from?

Mr. BURNETT. If you gentlemen would allow me, I would like to go on, because my time is limited. They only wear a little clothing, and under our system of indirect taxation to which the gentleman has referred they pay much less tariff tax than the American people, who wear more decent and costly clothing and use more costly imports, and they are, in that way, much less taxpayers than our people; they do not bear their proportion of the national taxes, and they do not bear much of the state taxes because, as a rule, they accumulate very little property themselves, and hence there is nothing upon which taxes can be levied.

Even if it was for the purpose of raising revenue, to a certain extent, outside of carrying on the Bureau of Immigration, I think it would be fair and just, if in some equitable way, these people should be compelled to pay some fair share of the taxes of the country—a country which gives them protection, a country which cares for them in its asylums, hospitals, and other public institutions—and a large number do go into insane and charitable asylums and into criminal institutions of the country—and for that reason and for other reasons I believe that would be a just requirement, in order to make them pay a fair proportion of the expenses which they themselves make necessary.

In regard to the \$25, money in the pocket. I think that is right because certainly if he was an American he might get along with less money in America when going to some other place in our country; but here are people who can not speak our language, who come here strangers to our customs, country, and our institutions, and even to our language. Now, is it reasonable to suppose that such persons will enjoy the same advantage of immediately having the ability and possibility of earning a livelihood as those who know more of the language and of our country? I believe it just to require them to have enough cash so they will not, at least, become a charge on the community to which they go. Out of kindness to them they ought to be required to have it to tide them over until they can find profitable employment and to take them out of New York and Boston. I might add other reasons, but the time for adjournment has come, and I shall ask leave to extend these suggestions. To my mind every one of these three requirements of the Hayes bill ought to be adopted in the interest of the whole country. In a document recently sent

out by the National Immigration League it is stated that the congested eastern cities are overrun with thousands of sturdy laborers without employment and often without bread. This condition should not exist.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. Is it your thought that the immigrant who comes for the first time and who pays the head tax, such as it may be—\$4 now, or \$10 as it is proposed to make it in the Hayes bill—has an unfair advantage over the man who is already here and who has assisted in building up the community?

Mr. BURNETT. I do think he has an unfair advantage over him, and I do not think it puts him to disadvantage to say that he must pay something to keep up the country that he is coming to—a country already provided for him by our people. Because we have not required it of those who have come prior to this time is no argument that we ought not to begin to require it of those who may come now.

Mr. MOORE, of Pennsylvania. To put it conversely, do you assert that the fact that the man who is already here, the man who has been here for many years, having helped to build up the country, justifies the imposition of this increased head tax upon the man who is coming in for the first time and who has not contributed to what has already been done?

Mr. BURNETT. I think that, because our people have been here all of this time, have paid their share of the taxes, and gotten the country in the condition it is in, the man who is coming here ought to contribute something to compensate for what his predecessor has already done for him.

Mr. MOORE. Your point would be that the man that comes in under these conditions, and finding the country already made, should pay well for it?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes, I think so; because he finds the country already built up by the taxes, the labor, and intellect of those who have been here. The best is worth paying for.

Mr. SABATH. He does not live on the country when he does arrive; the fact is he commences to increase the wealth of the country and commences to produce.

Mr. BURNETT. But while he is increasing it the other fellow who has been here all the time——

Mr. SABATH. Is benefited?

Mr. BURNETT. No, sir; is doing the same thing—that is, building up the country to a greater degree—and may suffer from the competition.

Mr. SABATH. Now, about the Italian not buying good clothing or not spending any large sums of money for clothing. I know that Italians do buy the best possible merchandise that is offered them. If you will notice them, you will find them wearing the best suits of clothes, and they are trying to buy the very best that they can find in the market.

Mr. MOORE. I would like to say, of my own knowledge, that Italians make excellent farmers. In certain parts of New Jersey there are entire communities of Italians who take up tracts of land and develop them.

Mr. HAYES. North or south Italians?

Mr. BURNETT. That is true, Mr. Moore, of the north Italian, and so it is with the Bohemians; but they are of a different class of men, and those are the people the educational test will not affect.

Mr. O'CONNELL. In Massachusetts, where the agricultural conditions are not of the best, the Italians, both north and south, have gone into our fields that were abandoned and have reclaimed them and made garden lands of them; they are bringing prosperity into those communities where the Puritans once lived.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. O'Connell, I will quote from a letter written by Mr. Walter L. Sears, superintendent of the State Free Employment Bureau of Massachusetts, under date of August 24, 1909, to the Immigration Restriction League of Boston, which has always favored the illiteracy test:

I heartily indorse in the main the object of your organization, but it would seem to me that much of the energy now spent in its work could well be devoted to the problem of how to get the people back on the land.

It has been said during these hearings that a large per cent of the immigrants returned to their own land. This is not true.

The United States seems to be about the only one of the new countries with any considerable net foreign immigration, that is, an excess of alien immigrants over alien emigrants. It is difficult to secure reliable statistics as to emigration, but what figures there are and such official statements as can be obtained from government publications and officials bears out the foregoing statement that the United States is the principal country to which European and western Asiatic emigrants are now going in large numbers. Canada and Argentine Republic are the only other countries with a foreign immigration worth mentioning, as far as this hemisphere or the southern part of the old hemisphere is concerned.

And in 1908 out of the 262,469 aliens that entered Canada, one-third—that is, 87,620—came from or via the United States. Of this number 59,832 were United States citizens and took with them, according to the Canadian superintendent of immigration, over \$60,000,000. Last year over 90,000 of our citizens crossed into Canada. During the past dozen years nearly half a million of our citizens have slipped or been “crowded,” James J. Hill says, over the border because “our public domain is exhausted” and “they are to be driven into ‘our’ factories and workshops” and into our congested cities, or across into Canada.

I have here a very interesting table, which we call “Table No. 1,” on this point:

Table showing immigration, emigration, debarred, and changes in tax for the last ten years.

[Compiled from annual reports of Commissioner-General of Immigration.]

Year ending June 30—	Immigrant alien arrivals. ^a	Per cent of immigrant aliens who have been in the United States before.	Nonimmigrant alien arrivals. ^a	Total alien arrivals. ^a	Total alien departures. ^b	Debarred aliens. ^a	Tax per capita. ^{a c}
1900.....	448,572	11.6	65,635	514,207	206,351	4,246	^d \$1.00
1901.....	487,918	11.9	74,950	562,868	209,318	3,516
1902.....	648,743	9.5	82,055	730,798	220,103	4,974
1903.....	857,046	8.9	64,269	921,315	247,559	8,769	^e 2.00
1904.....	812,870	12.8	27,844	840,714	332,019	7,994
1905.....	1,026,499	12.1	33,256	1,059,755	385,111	11,879
1906.....	1,100,735	12.1	65,618	1,166,353	356,257	12,432
1907.....	1,285,349	6.8	153,120	1,438,469	431,306	13,064	^f 4.00
1908.....	782,870	8.1	141,825	924,695	714,828	10,902
1909.....	751,786	(^g)	192,449	944,235	400,392	10,411	(^h)
Total for last ten years...	8,202,388	901,021	9,127,409	3,503,154	88,187

^a Official government statistics. (Annual reports of Commissioner-General of Immigration.)

^b Statistics furnished to the Government by steamship companies. (Required by act of February 20, 1907.)

^c The first head tax was a "duty of 50 cents," levied by the immigration act of August 3, 1882, "on all passengers not citizens brought to the United States by steam or sail vessel," and was held constitutional and Congress's power to tax unlimited and exclusive by the United States Supreme Court in 112 U. S., 580, under Congress's power to regulate commerce with foreign nations. The first paragraph of section 9, Article I, of the Constitution, limiting tax to \$10 on importation of slaves became obsolete in 1808, at which time Congress forbade such importation altogether, and which was for all practical purposes African exclusion.

^d By rider on an emergency act of 1894.

^e Immigration act of March 3, 1903.

^f Immigration act of February 20, 1907.

^g Not given in the 1909 annual report.

^h The sundry civil appropriation act of March 3, 1909, abolished the immigrant fund as a special fund July 1, 1909, and directed all receipts to be covered into the general or miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

The annual reports of the Commissioner-General of Immigration show a number of interesting facts. During the past decade over 9,000,000 aliens have entered the country and over three and one-half have left. Of those that come for the first time with avowed intention of staying not over one-tenth on the average have ever been in the country before, which seems to show that a very small part of the large number of aliens that leave the United States annually comparatively few of them do return. Eighty-eight thousand one hundred and eighty-seven aliens have been debarred since 1899, as against 9,127,409 admitted, or less than 1 per cent. But perhaps the most striking fact is the gradual but enormous annual increase in volume down to 1907, when 1,438,469 aliens entered the United States, only to drop down just below the one million mark in 1908 and 1909, during the depression. There is a corresponding increase in alien emigration which becomes all the more pronounced during 1908, almost doubling in that year, only to drop back to about 40 per cent of the alien influx in 1909 with the first signs of returning prosperity. Immigration would seem now to be just starting on another enormous upward movement or wave, which will, unless there is restrictive legislation, doubtless run still higher than the last, and help to increase and intensify the crash and the unemployed by the presence of large numbers of them here and the hasty exit of others with savings.

The following table (No. 2) brings out an interesting fact:

Table comparing the immigration and emigration of certain other countries with that of the United States.

[Compiled from official immigration reports, consular reports, Monthly Bulletin of South American Republics, etc.]

Year.	United States.		Canada. ^a		Australia. ^b	
	Total alien ar-rivals.	Total alien de-partures. ^c	Alien ar-rivals direct from Old World.	Alien ar-rivals from or via United States.	Alien im-migration.	Alien emi-gration.
1899.....	356,715	172,837	^d 32,598	^d 11,945
1900.....	514,207	206,351	15,352	8,543
1901.....	562,868	209,318	31,162	17,987
1902.....	730,798	220,103	40,991	26,388	274,105	243,507
1903.....	921,315	247,559	78,891	49,473
1904.....	840,714	332,019	85,101	45,229
1905.....	1,059,755	385,111	102,594	43,693
1906.....	1,166,353	356,257	^e 54,780	^e 30,971
1907.....	1,438,469	431,306	138,591	84,111
1908.....	924,695	714,828	174,849	87,620

Year.	Peru. ^f	Brazil. ^g		Argentine Republic. ^h	
	Alien im-migration.	Alien ar-rivals.	Alien de-partures.	Arrivals.	Depar-tures.
1899.....	1,107	25,130	111,083	62,241
1900.....	1,663	29,121	105,902	55,417
1901.....	1,014	26,292	125,951	80,251
1902.....	96,080	79,427
1903.....	18,161	36,410	112,671	74,427
1904.....	27,751	32,179	161,078	66,597
1905.....	221,622	82,772
1906.....	27,147	302,249	103,852
1907.....	31,150	257,924	138,063
1908.....	48,216	28,457

^a Canada has practically the same excluded classes as the United States, but its immigration laws give the governor in council the power to prohibit the landing of any specified class of aliens and of immigrants not coming by continuous journey upon through tickets purchased in their own country. Under this discretionary authority by orders in council, Hindoos, Asiatics not having \$200 in possession, immigrants coming via steamship lines unwilling to carry undesirables back free, certain aliens not having from \$25 to \$50 and ticket to destination, etc., are excluded.

^b Australia, New Zealand, New South Wales, Natal, and Cape Colony have much better immigration laws than any other country, and exclude among others aliens unable to read and write at dictation 50 words in an European language or dialect.

^c These particular statistics furnished voluntarily by the steamship companies, but required so to do beginning July 1, 1907, by immigration act of February 20, 1907.

^d First six months of 1900; change made from calendar to fiscal year.

^e First nine months fiscal year 1906.

^f Peru on May 14, 1909, excluded Chinese having less than 500 pounds in cash.

^g Brazilian Review, March 9, 1909, gives these statistics for Rio de Janeiro, which like New York for the United States, receives about 80 per cent of the travel.

^h Official report of minister of agriculture and director of immigration. The statistics include immigration "directa de ultramar" and "por via de Montevideo." Argentine has more available fertile public lands, offers greater inducements probably, etc., but has never attained a net immigration of over 198,397 (1907), which fell to 119,861 in 1908.

NOTE.—Panama has adopted the United States immigration laws and has prohibited the naturalization of Chinese, Syrians, and Turks. Mexico is now conducting an official investigation with a view to immigration legislation.

(At 12 o'clock the committee adjourned.)

THE COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION

AND NATURALIZATION,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, March 29, 1910.

The committee met at 10.30 a. m., with Hon. Benjamin F. Howell (chairman) presiding. Others present were Representatives Bennet, Hayes, Burnett, Elvins, Küstermann, and Goldfogle.

**STATEMENT OF MRS. MARY GRACE QUACKENBOS, ATTORNEY
AND COUNSELOR AT LAW, NEW YORK, N. Y.**

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Quackenbos, we will let you proceed in your own way.

Mr. BURNETT. Do you desire to address yourself to the bill introduced by Mr. Sabbath?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes, sir; the bill H. R. 21426, to increase the scope of the work of the Division of Information of the Department of Commerce and Labor. It is the distribution bill. I have not discussed with Mr. Sabbath any particular way of advancing this proposition, so I will commence by outlining the bill.

Section 1 changes the name of the bureau from "Division of Information" to "Division of Distribution and Information." This better defines the purpose of the division and gives a more intelligent idea as to its functions. The present title is misleading, the principal object of the division being to bring about the equitable distribution of aliens throughout the States and Territories.

Sections 2, 3, and 4 provide that the division of distribution and information shall collect information as to general labor conditions throughout the United States and shall publish the same each month in bulletin form for the use of officials and others having to do with the admission of aliens. Such information shall be furnished also to all persons legally within the United States, but to no others. The bill, therefore, provides that said information shall not be published abroad.

In order to have efficient distribution, it is necessary for this division to collect information of every available kind having to do with labor conditions in this country, and I understand that the commissioners of immigration at the landing ports also send out inspectors to gather such information. The work, and the expense of same, are therefore duplicated. This bill will save the duplicate expense. All such information will be centralized in the one bureau—the Division of Information. The bill also provides that officials at the ports of landing shall give due weight to the information contained in the bulletins in determining the eligibility of aliens to land.

The CHAIRMAN. If we published this information, they would get it abroad?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. The bill provides for the publishing of bulletins to be made use of solely in this country, and that the information contained therein is not to be published abroad.

Do you wish me to continue outlining the bill or to take up discussion of the evidence which supports it? Please state your pleasure in the matter.

Mr. HAYES. We will leave it entirely to you.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Then, I will review the sections hurriedly.

Sections 2, 3, and 4 I have discussed but call your attention again to the part which provides that the officials of the Immigration Service shall give weight to the question of demand in admitting aliens.

Mr. BURNETT. At the ports?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes, sir; but I want to say that I would amend that section. The section reads that they "shall give full weight to such information in determining the eligibility of aliens to enter the United States, taking into consideration the calling, trade, or vocation of the alien and the demand for persons of his or her calling, trade, or vocation at the point to which he or she is destined." If a hundred men want to go to Kansas to do masonry work and there is no demand for masons in Kansas they would not be admitted to go to Kansas. The division could inform them as to where masons are in demand, and they would be permitted to proceed to that particular locality.

Mr. BURNETT. They could not determine that until after they were admitted?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. That is just what I think. To my mind, it would be advisable to strike out that part of the bill and simply provide that such information shall be given to the officials at the immigration stations and others legally entitled to the same. But I think it is not within the province of officials at the landing ports to tell immigrants that they can or can not go to a particular place.

The CHAIRMAN. After admitted?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Even after admission, the alien should not be told to go to one place or another. Correct information as to all working opportunities should be laid before him and he should then be free to choose the particular locality in which he desires to work and live.

If he is not capable of making a choice he should be advised by persons of his own nationality—one who understands the immigrant and the conditions from which he has come and what he is capable of doing here. The questions of admission and rejection are entirely distinct, and should be separated from the question of distribution. I think it is a fact that heretofore opposition against distribution has resulted from confusion of these terms. Some have failed to note that distribution takes effect only after the question of admission has been determined and that distribution has really nothing to do with immigration, but that it simply evens up things and solves difficult problems with which we are confronted in this country, such as the problems of congestion of population, development of undeveloped resources, high cost of living, the tuberculosis problem, etc.

Mr. BURNETT. They will give information to anyone who asks for it; I mean under the present existing law?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes, sir; but it strengthens the present law to insert in this bill a proviso that the information shall be given only to those who are legally within the United States and to no others. I will give you my reason for this: I have discussed this question with Mr. John Mitchell, who said he understood that the Division of Information was advertised abroad. He said that in the Slav countries and in Italy the steamship agents tell would-be emigrants in remote peasant provinces that there is in the United States a

government agency which will procure work for all who migrate to America. I think that Mr. Mitchell is mistaken in this, for I spent eight months recently traveling through these peasant provinces and heard not a word of it. In different countries of Europe I asked if this division were known, but no one seemed ever to have heard of the "Division of Information."

Mr. BURNETT. How recently?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I left America January, 1909, and returned the latter part of September of the same year. In order to be sure, however, that this part of my investigation was correct, I wrote a letter two weeks ago to Mr. T. V. Powderly, Chief of the Division of Information. I asked him to answer the question.

Here is a copy of my letter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 14, 1910.*

T. V. POWDERLY, Esq.,

Chief Division of Information,

Department of Commerce and Labor, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am informed that the steamship agents in Italy and the Slav countries, seeking to induce peasants to emigrate to America——

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. What letter are you reading from?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. A letter which I wrote to Mr. Powderly, prompted by the criticism made by Mr. John Mitchell, who said that he had heard that the Division of Information was advertised abroad, and that therefore it induced abnormal immigration. As I have said, I believe that Mr. Mitchell has been misinformed in this connection, because I have investigated this matter, both in Europe and in the United States, and do not find that such is the fact.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. What do they say respecting the congestion that results from the immigrants remaining in the cities?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. That is really another question which they did not say anything about, but which we can probably take up a little later, if you do not mind. I went abroad and traveled mule-back through the peasant provinces of certain countries in southern Europe, from which a large part of our immigration comes. Before doing so, I had resigned my position as special assistant to the Attorney-General, so that I might be free to place whatever information I secured before Congress or use it in any way I deemed best, without being restricted.

As I said, I heard nothing of the government distribution bureau in Europe. I talked to a large number of peasants. They never heard of the Division of Information. Upon my return I desired to secure official information as to whether the Department of Commerce and Labor had ever heard that the division was advertised abroad. Accordingly, I wrote this letter to the Department of Commerce and Labor inquiring whether the federal distribution bureau was advertised abroad or whether the department had ever heard that it was so advertised. The letter and the answer thereto are really very important, and if you do not object I will read them. This is my letter to Mr. Powderly:

I am informed that the steamship agents in Italy and the Slav countries, seeking to induce peasants to emigrate to America, spread the news in peasant provinces abroad that the United States Government will furnish work for immigrants after they land in America. I am informed also that this stimulates immigration abnormally.

Will you be good enough to let me know whether this is a fact. In other words, are the applicants at your New York branch and other branches those who have been

recommended by the steamship agents abroad, or who have in some other way learned in Europe that through the government distribution bureau they could find work.

May I ask what proportion of such applicants you have, if such is the case. And will you kindly tell me how the other applicants learn of the good offices of your division.

I addressed this letter to Mr. Powderly because he is the chief of the division. An answer came from Mr. Powderly and the same day I saw Mr. Keefe, the Commissioner-General of Immigration, and asked him whether he confirmed what Mr. Powderly wrote. He told me that he did, and therefore, though you have not the Commissioner-General's signature to it, you have my word that he said that there was no foundation for the rumor that the Division of Information was advertised abroad, although he knew that there had once been a rumor to that effect.

Mr. Powderly's answer to my letter is as follows:

Your letter of even date, addressed to the chief of the Division of Information, in which you say, "I am informed that the steamship agents in Italy and the Slav countries, seeking to induce peasants to emigrate to America, spread the news in peasant provinces abroad that the United States Government will furnish work for immigrants after they land in America. I am informed also that this stimulates immigration abnormally," is before me, and in reply I have to say that about a year ago a rumor that immigration was stimulated through circulating the report abroad that the division of information would find work for immigrants upon arrival in this country was investigated and no evidence of any kind or character was produced to bear out or lend color to the rumor. Since that time the inspector in charge of information work at New York has made diligent inquiry of those who called upon him for information, and up to the present time not one has stated that they were informed abroad of the existence of the Division of Information.

Immigrants have been questioned on arrival at immigrant stations as to whether they had heard of the existence of the Division of Information, but so far none of them has indicated that they had any knowledge of it.

You ask how applicants for information learn of the good offices of the division, and I take the liberty of inclosing with this a leaflet, printed in various languages, which the officers of the Immigration Service hand to immigrants after they have been duly landed.

So far we have no evidence to bear out the statement that immigration is stimulated in any way by reports circulated abroad concerning the existence of the Division of Information.

Respectfully, yours,

T. V. POWDERLY, *Chief of Division.*

I have written at the foot of the page:

This letter was confirmed by Mr. Keefe, Commissioner-General of Immigration, during a personal conversation later in the day.

I place on record these letters and a pamphlet issued by the Department of Commerce and Labor [exhibiting]. It is the pamphlet of which Mr. Powderly speaks. It reads in English and various other languages:

The United States Government has established a Division of Information, the duty of which is to gather from all available sources information as to localities where settlers are needed; where farm lands are for sale or for rent, with the prices and terms upon which they can be bought or rented, and also where different kinds of work can be obtained. For this information you should call at the Information Branch, United States Immigration Service, 17 Pearl street, New York City, where will be found government officers able to converse with you in your own language. There is no fee or charge for the information given.

These are not distributed on board ship, nor at the sailing ports abroad.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. In different languages?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes, sir; in different languages.

To continue: Nevertheless, from my experience in this work, I knew very well that immigration was stimulated abroad by steamship and private employment agencies. For nearly three years I had assisted the Department of Justice in the prosecution of peonage cases, and had sole charge of the cases in New York City against labor agents who had lured ignorant foreigners into peonage camps. As an attorney for the Department of Justice, I filed charges against these agents before the commissioner of licenses in New York City and various licenses were revoked. Immigrants had been horribly defrauded, in some instances, by their own countrymen. I do not find that they are defrauded by Americans. Through the courtesy of the Department of Justice, I have brought over some records of these cases, taken from the files. Before reading the records, I will say that when I was engaged upon this work we found no federal statute under which we could prosecute these agents and have their licenses revoked.

The peonage investigations brought out facts which proved quite clearly that many New York labor agents who sent immigrants from New York State to other States under employment contracts were deceiving these immigrants as to conditions of work and living, as to wages and hours of labor, often as to the locality to which they were going, and in very many cases they would promise a kind of employment which did not exist in the locality to which they were sent. For instance, expert masons were sent to a cotton plantation; boys promised work in a licorice factory were sent to a turpentine camp; a tailor to a mine. We made request to the then Attorney-General, either Mr. Moody or Mr. Bonaparte—I do not for the moment remember which (I was appointed under Mr. Moody)—for permission to use the government funds for the purpose of prosecuting these swindling agents. Without an appropriation I had no money for witness fees, and it was not right to ask workmen to stay away from their work without remuneration in order to aid us with their testimony before the commissioner of licenses.

Mr. BURNETT. That is a state officer?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. A municipal officer, appointed by the mayor. The Attorney-General asked the Comptroller of the Treasury for an opinion as to whether we could expend the government money for this purpose. The comptroller held that we could, since these prosecutions were a preventive of peonage. He permitted us to use a part of the "miscellaneous fund" for witness fees in such cases. I place on record the comptroller's decision [exhibiting], dated May 24, 1907, signed by the Comptroller of the Treasury himself.

I will read certain parts of it. The letter is addressed to the Attorney-General. It reads:

The facts recited in your letter call for such a construction of the law as will enable the Government to stamp out the barbarities recited therein if such a construction can, under any fair rule of construction, be given to an appropriation. I am inclined to adopt a most liberal construction of the appropriation last referred to—

Which is the miscellaneous fund—

because of the end to be accomplished by its use and because of the further fact that it is by its terms a miscellaneous appropriation and can only be expended under the direct authorization of the Attorney-General of the United States.

We were not handicapped thereafter in prosecuting agents who made a business of swindling workmen. For instance, men who were sent to a lumber camp in Georgia after being promised indoor

work in a furniture factory were brought from Georgia to New York to confront the agent and testify against him.

This resulted in the revocation of the agent's license. Such employment agents tell a workman any kind of a story to tempt him to enter into the contract. One Joe Marks, a Russian tailor, was promised tailoring work in Tennessee, but was sent to the copper mines. He had lately come from Russia; he had never been in a mine; he was afraid he could not do the work; he was driven away because of his worthlessness; he walked across the Blue Ridge Mountains without money or food; later he stole a ride on a train and was arrested on the State border and sent to a Georgia convict camp, where he committed suicide. This case is a matter of record in Georgia, for I am informed that the governor had Marks's body exhumed to ascertain whether he did commit suicide or whether he had been beaten to death in the convict camp. It was decided that he had committed suicide, probably from despair. There are many sad cases which could have been prevented. And similar cases can be prevented if this bill becomes a law. The all-important question to the agent is his fee. He makes a commission of from \$5 to \$15 for each laborer sent out, and I know of a New York agent—a self-confessed criminal in his native land—whose partner testified that he made over \$10,000 on commissions in a few months' time.

This agent conducted an outrageous business, but we brought about the revocation of his license.

Mr. BURNETT. Those labor agents are usually of their own nationality?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURNETT. That would be a matter of police regulation that Congress could not control?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. This law will place these private agencies under federal supervision in so far as they send laborers from one State to another under contract of employment. Such agents will have to obtain a license from the Department of Commerce and Labor and can be prosecuted and punished in addition to having their licenses taken away from them, if this bill becomes a law. This of course does not apply to the sending of laborers to places within the State.

Mr. BURNETT. That may be true if it is interstate commerce.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. The comptroller said further:

It would be a confession I am not willing to make and which ought not to be true, that the arm of the Government is not long enough or its purse is so short, that because of its lack of reach or want of adequate language in an appropriation—such want being ascertained through a purely technical construction of such language—human slavery can be reinaugurated in the United States.

I am therefore constrained to hold under the limitation set out that the ultimate purpose of such evidence is or may be for use in the United States courts in the enforcement of the criminal laws—

The laws referred to being the peonage statutes—

that the appropriation for the collection of evidence heretofore cited may be used for the purposes indicated in your communication.

As to immigration, it is not induced at all by the federal distribution bureau, but I will prove to you how it is induced. There is a way of stopping abnormal immigration, and upon this point I have much information which I shall be glad to give to this committee at another time.

Mr. BURNETT. Induced by whom?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. By the steamship agents abroad. There are 13,000 of them in Italy alone. There is generally one in every province, and he has many subagents and runners.

Mr. HAYES. Can not you give us that information?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I shall be glad to at another time.

Mr. HAYES. We shall be very glad to have it.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. The bill under consideration applies to distribution, which is another question. I trust I have shown that immigration is not induced by the federal distribution bureau. I am confident that no evidence can be found to sustain such a rumor. The unconscionable steamship agent abroad, who lives in the province with the peasant, who tempts him to leave his native land and his family and often to mortgage his old home in order to secure money for the ticket, from which the agent will get a commission—he is the man who helps induce our abnormal immigration. His friend, or business associate, the labor agent, on this side of the water, preying upon the immigrant after he is admitted in a like unconscionable way, too frequently dominates him and defrauds him and lives at the expense of this his less enterprising countryman. In this miserable business both agents become well to do. The worst evil is not wrought by the immigrant, but is suffered by him.

I will give you an instance of how these agents work together: My traveling companion was an American professor, a woman well known in this country and abroad, who speaks Italian fluently, having lived in Italy about seven years. In June we went up in Apennines to Aquila of the Abruzzi, a mountain town. In the window of a barber's shop we were attracted by a large paper poster entitled "Avviso," near the door of the shop. It mentioned a bank at 60 Mulberry street, New York City, and one Luigi Alleva & Son, bankers.

The avviso was of striking appearance, about three by two feet in size, pink in color, with black lettering. Near it, posted also conspicuously on the other side of the shop window, was a huge billboard, about 8 feet high, consisting of three red, white, and blue paper signs, exactly similar, pasted one above the other, advertising the steerage and second-class passage rates and the sailings of the steamers from Naples to New York of the Hamburg-American Line. Both signs were in Italian, and copies, identical, are hereto annexed, marked "Exhibit 1" (avviso) and "Exhibit 2" (sailing list).

The avviso, translated, is as follows:

The undersigned desires to call the attention of all emigrants for North America to the fact that he has in New York, U. S. A., a banking house; further that he attends to the shipping of goods or the sending of money to all parts of the world, that he conducts the business of a notary, and sells tickets for all steamship and railroad lines.

At the same office there are at the disposition of the public four young men very well acquainted with the city and the suburbs, who are always ready to furnish to emigrants all information of which they have need, acting as interpreter for them at the wharf at the battery and accompanying them to any place of work.

The said bank as a guaranty to all has a deposit with the State of New York of the sum of 75,000 lire in addition to other property to the value of 115,000 lire.

The undersigned by reason of the trustworthy character of his firm and the guarantees offered hopes to be honored by the business of the Italian emigrants.

Underneath the Hamburg-American announcement was an orange-colored paper, a yard long, printed in large, black type, as follows [Exhibit 7]:

Rappresentanti sig. Salvatore Giannangeli; Presso il salone Italia, Corso V. E. N. 104 (Palazzo Crolina), Aquila.

(A copy, identical, is annexed, marked "Exhibit 3.")

Several days prior to June 30 we had read a government edict, which was posted on the wall of the general post-office at Aquila, issued by the royal commissariato dell'emigrazione, Roma, April, 1909.

It advised all Italians against emigrating to the United States, and, translated, the edict is as follows [original annexed, Exhibit 4]:

In three months only of this year there have departed for the United States more than 100,000 Italians, while the work actually in progress is not sufficient to give occupation to such a vast crowd of workmen. Many of those who are already on the ground are still without work and are in a pitiable condition. Our emigrants are advised in the strongest terms not to go to the United States where they, on their arrival, might very likely fail to find work.

We had heard of this Aquila agent from the peasants higher up in the mountains whom we had visited before going to Aquila. As the avviso in the barber shop was decidedly inconsistent with the government edict we called upon Giannangeli and asked him many questions. My friend who interpreted has made affidavit before the United States consul in Rome. It relates the whole transaction. I will quote from it:

I started by saying that the lady with me was writing a story about emigration and wanted to know all the little details as to what he was going to do with the people going to America. I asked: "Do many of them go over?"

"Barber. For a long while, no; but business is picking up again [nodding and winking].

"Question. The signora (meaning Mrs. Quackenbos) wants to know how it is done. She wants to talk with some one who helps laborers to go over—some labor agent or some one.

"Barber (interrupting). I'm the rappresentante.

"Question. Are you the rappresentante just for the steamship company for the people who go over?

"Barber. Of the steamship company, but I help the people to go over.

"Question. Do they go in very great numbers?

"Barber. They used to, and they are beginning to again, but it was stopped for a while. See here."

Then the barber stepped to the back of the shop and removed from against the wall a second huge 8-foot billboard of the Hamburg-American sailings, like the red, white, and blue one out on the street [Exhibit 2 is one-third of it]. He showed me that completely hidden behind it was one of the edicts issued by the Italian Government exactly similar to the one which we had seen in the post-office as aforesaid [Exhibit 4].

"Question. What sort of a thing is that? (I pointed to the words 'R. Commissariato dell'Emigrazione.')

"Barber. Oh, that comes from the government people.

"Question. What about that [pointing at the avviso at the door].

"Barber. Oh, those are the people in New York. That's the bank there.

"Question. What's it all about. Can the signora have one of these [pointing to the avviso].

"Barber. Yes, yes; delighted. I'm the rappresentante of these people, too."

I then said: "The signora would like to see all the papers she can in connection with this business. She wants to know all about it."

He answered: "I have a book which has all the items, all the different towns in all the various parts of the United States, and all the railroad fares to these towns."

I said to Giannangeli: "How about this banker? What have you to do with banking in New York City?"

He said that he was also a labor agent, and that it was better for me and my friend to see the banker in New York as some of the people were too poor to pay their passage and Alleva could fix it all right. He brought out a book and two letters which my friend translated. I felt sorry for the man when he innocently let me copy from them a letter, dated June 14 [reads]: "Remember that no agent or subagent in Italy possesses this book." I said: "What book?" He answered, "I have a book which has all the items, all the different towns in the various parts of the United States, and all the railroad fares to these towns."

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Published by whom?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I do not know. Perhaps it is published by the steamship or railroad companies. The printer is Martin B. Brown & Co., New York City.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Did you make any investigation upon which to base your opinion that the steamship companies were publishing the book?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I made a slight investigation. The contents of the book are described in the affidavit. I will read it:

He then went to a cabinet and brought out a yellow-covered book about the size of an ordinary pamphlet of from 250 to 300 pages; we noticed that the entire book contained, page after page, alphabetical lists of (as he said) all the small towns in the United States with their respective counties and States, together with six or seven columns of figures placed opposite the names of the towns, etc., and extending across the entire page. We could not examine the book very closely without exciting suspicion, so I said:

"Can the signora have this, too?"

"Barber. Oh, no; this was just sent to me.

"Question. Have you any more copies?"

"Barber. No; I have just one, but the signora could learn a lot if she could stay here long enough, so could use this book of mine."

Mrs. Quackenbos then said she would get one of the books, and asked if she could copy the name; this I translated to the barber, and he acquiesced, saying that the bank would send her a copy if requested.

The words on the cover of the book copied by Mrs. Quackenbos were as follows:

"Joint tariff No. 13. Immigrant fares from Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, in effect May, 1906, subject to change. Immigrant clearing house committee, L. P. Farmer, chairman. H. C. Blye, general agent, 143 Liberty street, New York City, U. S. A. Copyright, 1906, by L. P. Farmer. Martin B. Brown & Co., printers, New York City."

The letter goes on to say, "and therefore you will not allow it (meaning the book) to be seen by no one." I saw a similar book in two other places in Italy, and in Sparta, Greece.

The letter further says:

You will make use of it (the book) exclusively for your own business and for the individuals who will come over at times to my bank.

It further says:

As I wrote you in my other letter, jobs go well for all those who arrive not too late. Write to me assuring me that you have received as much as — and tell me all that which may be likely to interest me.

Both letters were signed "Luigi Alleva" in the same handwriting. Another letter, dated a few days before, said:

You will inform friends and acquaintances that the jobs there are many and good of every kind, and that therefore those who intend to come should not lose time if they do not want to do it too late.

Mr. BURNETT. Did that letter pass between the same parties?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes, sir. I asked the Italian agent to give me the card of this man in New York, and he handed me all of these cards [exhibiting about 15 cards]. I have a lot more which he gave me and some envelopes. In all, he gave me 36 business envelopes advertising the Banca Luigi Alleva & Figli, 60 Mulberry street, New York City [exhibit]; 26 of the banker's business cards reading, "Luigi & Figli, 60 Mulberry street, New York City, United States of America [exhibit]; 1 of the advertisements of the Hamburg-American Steamship Company [Exhibit 4]; 2 of the avvisi [Exhibit 1]; several of the orange-colored announcements representing himself as agent (repesentante) [Exhibit 7].

When I returned to New York I found through the commissioner of licenses that Alleva was a regularly licensed labor agent doing business under the name Luigi Alleva & Son and Romano. I believe the banking part of the business is done under the name of Alleva & Son. On the letter heads or printed circular of the Hamburg-American Line which he gave me the Aquila agent appears as agent for that line. The name of Alleva, the New York banker and labor agent, appears in the body of the printed letter. I think it a sad fact that such a great company as the Hamburg-American should employ men of this character. And the law we are discussing is designed to put all such agents under federal supervision. The steamship company appears to indorse these men as their agents, for they permit them to sell their tickets.

Mr. BURNETT. Appears in what capacity?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I will read from the printed letter head. It is in Italian, I will give you the translation. I should not care to have these documents made public yet.

Mr. HAYES. We can have all the documents printed and hold them back until Mr. Williams has made his investigation. The stuff you are giving us is very valuable.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. What evidence have you obtained that the Hamburg-American Line directly or indirectly caused these circulars to be printed?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. This is their letter head [exhibiting]. This Italian agent had a large number of such letter heads, or circulars, whatever they may be called.

Mr. HAYES. With the same reference.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes, sir.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Have you found other letters in other ship offices?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I saw the clearing-house book also in Geneva, in Turin, Italy, and in Sparta, Greece. The steamship agents have a large round sign outside of their offices generally with a ship painted on it and the word "agent" in brass letters under the name of the line. I saw such signs in all countries. There were such in the Abruzzi Mountains.

Mr. BURNETT. At what point was that?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. At Aquila, Italy, in the Abruzzi Mountains. It is a little south of the central part of Italy, I believe. I will place on record this affidavit, which will give you all the information you desire.

Here is the letter head, or circular, of the Hamburg-American Line, with blanks for the sailing dates to be filled in. On the first page is a picture of a ship plying the ocean at full speed, underneath which, in large type, is the following:

Hamburg-Amerika Line. Vapori, Celerissimi Germanesi.

Next came a list of sailings, etc., with blanks to be filled in (see Exhibit 10), and below in large type are the words:

Uffici Di Rappresentanza Aquila, Corso, Vitt. Em. N. 104, Palazzi Crolina, Aquila.

On the lower half of the same page is printed a letter, which translated into English is as follows (see Exhibit 10):

AQUILLA, ———, 190—.

RESPECTED FRIEND: Having just been informed that you have decided to depart for America, I pray you to do me the pleasure of coming to me as representative of the Hamburg Company, if you desire to travel with the large and swift steamers of the company named, highly prized by all and preferred especially because they offer every convenience and means of safety.

Since there exists a great crowd in these months, I recommend to you to give me your order to obtain at once your passport. Regarding the making out of the documents and the securing of the passport, I place myself at your disposition, as also for the necessary information for the tribunale and for the Milla Osta in this prefettura.

I assure you that I will use all the possible diligence and I will see that the society does the same in such a method that you will make the trip quickly, well, and with safety, aided in this also by Signor Luigi Alleva e Figli, who have in New York, at 60 Mulberry street, a banking place and in addition have, for the use of emigrants, employees appointed, who are able to secure for them all information and assistance.

With respect, the representative,

GRANNANGELI SALVATORE.

There is no printing on the inside pages of the sheet, but on the back side of the sheet, page 4, there is printing arranged so that the sheet can be folded and addressed like an envelope, and when folded reads [Exhibit 11]:

Aquilla—Rappresentante Giannangeli Salvatore, Aquilla, Hamburg-Amerikan Line. Compagnia di Nangazione a Vapore Amburghere, Amerika.

Ill Mo. Signor, ———. To Mr. ———.

The business envelope of the Mulberry street banker reads:

Mr. ———, 60 Mulberry street, New York City, U. S. of Amerika. Care of Banca, Luigi Alleva e Figli.

Mr. BURNETT. What was the date of that letter?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. This was not sent; this is a blank. My interpreter's affidavit is dated August 4, 1909. Our conversation with the Aquila agent took place in June. We made many notes which we framed into this affidavit later.

You will see, gentlemen, that it is the private money-making agencies that induce immigration, not the federal bureau of which the peasants in Europe do not know. Most of the opposition to the federal agency comes from those who are directly or indirectly connected with these money-making concerns. The welfare of our nation and of these alien strangers whom we admit into our country demand that the private money-making agencies be placed under federal supervision. If they do their business honestly let them make their fees; if they conduct their business dishonestly let them be prosecuted and punished and let their licenses be taken from them. There are 800 agents in New York City and there are many in all the other large cities, but of course I do not say that they are all corrupt.

Mr. BURNETT. Section 7 provides for obtaining a license in order to engage in business, but unless that was interstate commerce, I do not think Congress would have any authority?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I think the section should be amended and the license be required only when laborers are sent under contract from one State to another.

Mr. BURNETT. The section does not say so.

Mr. HAYES. They have the authority to limit that.

Mr. BURNETT. That would be a matter for police regulation.

Mr. HAYES. An agent receiving aliens from abroad landed in this country should come under the federal statutes.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. If he was in conspiracy with some one else.

Mr. HAYES. Yes, sir. Of course we can reach them.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. But they could send a laborer from New York to Albany without such license?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Section 7 of what bill?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Of this bill. It says "That no person, firm, or corporation shall open, operate, or maintain a private employment agency for hire of aliens," etc.

Mr. BURNETT. In those broad terms, I think that would come under the facts pointed out in the Keller case.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I agree with you.

Mr. BURNETT. This requirement of license by the agent—you can not say there was a conspiracy to get the license; that would be too remote. This section would have to be considerably changed.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I would split up this bill into two bills. In one bill I would provide for the enlargement of the scope of the federal distribution bureau; in the other I would deal with the federal license and provide for the prosecution and punishment of the agent when he violates the law. Labor agents are constantly violating the law.

Mr. BURNETT. Generally?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes, sir; I could get the names and addresses of the agents in New York City who have done so, and of some who, I believe, are now so doing. Probably Mr. Bennet has such information now. Many of these agents run a banking business as well.

Mr. BENNET. I have not it now, but it could be easily procured.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Here [exhibiting] is a report made to me by a special agent of the Department of Justice which tells of the cases brought by that department against certain New York labor agents.

Mr. HAYES. Can you appear before the committee to-morrow morning?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. There is only five minutes before the hour of adjournment and I therefore suggest that we adjourn to meet to-morrow at 10.30 o'clock a. m.

(Thereupon the committee adjourned.)

(The affidavit made by Esther Boise Van Deman before Kenneth Stuart Patton, vice-consul at Rome, Italy, for the United States, from which Mrs. Quackenbos quoted at different times, reads in full as follows:)

KINGDOM OF ITALY, *Province of City of Rome, ss:*

Esther Boise Van Deman, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

I am an American, professor of Latin and Archæology in the United States, and now reside at No. 12 Piazza dell' Esquilino, Rome, Italy. I am familiar with the Italian language and can speak it fluently.

On June 30, 1909, in the evening of that day, in company with Mary Grace Quackenbos, of New York City, I was in the town of Aquila, in the Abruzzi Mountains, Province of Aquila, Italy. While waiting at the Hotel d' Italia for a train leaving Aquila that night, we were attracted by a large paper poster, entitled "AVVISO," posted near the door of a barber shop across the street; it mentioned a bank at 60 Mulberry street, New York City; banker, Luigi Allewa and Son.

The avviso was of striking appearance, about 3 by 2 feet in size, pink in color, with black lettering. Near it, posted also conspicuously on the other side of the shop window, was a huge billboard, about 8 feet high, consisting of three red, white, and blue paper signs exactly similar, pasted one above the other, advertising the steerage and second-class passage rates and the sailings of steamers from Naples to New York of the Hamburg-American Line. Both signs were in Italian, and copies, identical, are hereto annexed, marked "Exhibit I.—*Avviso*," and "Exhibit II.—*Sailing list*."

The avviso translated is as follows:

"The undersigned desires to call the attention of all emigrants for North America to the fact that he has in New York, U. S. A., a banking house; further, that he attends to the shipping of goods or the sending of money to all parts of the world; that he conducts the business of a notary, and sells tickets for all steamship and railroad lines.

"At the same office there are at the disposition of the public four young men, very well acquainted with the city and the suburbs, who are always ready to furnish to emigrants all information of which they have need, acting as interpreter for them at the wharf at the Battery, and accompanying them to any place of work.

"The said bank as a guaranty to all has a deposit with the State of New York of the sum of 75,000 lire, in addition to other property to the value of 115,000 lire.

"The undersigned, by reason of the trustworthy character of his firm and the guarantees offered, hopes to be honored (by the business) of the Italian emigrants."

Underneath the Hamburg-American announcement was an orange-colored paper, a yard long, printed in large black type, as follows (Exhibit VII):

"Rappresentanti Sig. Salvatore Giannangeli. Presso il Salone Italia, Corso V. E. N. 104 (Palazzo Crolina) Aquila."

A copy, identical, is annexed, marked "Exhibit III."

Several days prior to June 30 we had read a government edict which was posted on the wall of the general post-office at Aquila, issued by the Royal Commissariato dell'Emigrazione, Roma, April, 1909. It advised all Italians against emigrating to the United States; and translated the edict is as follows (original annexed "EXHIBIT IV"):

"In three months only of this year there have departed for the United States more than 100,000 Italians, while the work actually in progress is not sufficient to give occupation to such a vast crowd of workmen.

"Many of those who are already on the ground are still without work and are in a pitiable condition.

"Our emigrants are advised in the strongest terms not to go to the United States, where they on their arrival might very likely fail to find work."

Since the Avviso at the barber shop was decidedly inconsistent with the government edict in the post-office, Mrs. Quackenbos, who was at the time investigating and writing upon immigrant questions, suggested that we call upon the barber, Giannangeli, and ask him concerning his emigration business. Mrs. Q. decided that we could gain more truthful information if we did not tell our names, but said that we knew of a cotton plantation in the United States—in Arkansas—in which a Mr. Frank was interested, and that if labor could be imported she (Mrs. Q.) would like to find out in all its details how it could be done, that she might send the information to the said Frank in America.

We entered the shop. The barber said he spoke no English and Mrs. Q. speaks no Italian. Therefore, pursuant to the questions put to me by Mrs. Q. in English, in the presence of the barber, I carried on the following conversation with him in Italian.

I started by saying that the lady with me was writing a story about emigration and wanted to know all the little details as to what he was going to do with the people going to America. I asked: "Do many of them go over?"

"Barber. For a long while, no; but business is picking up again [nodding and winking].

"Question. The signora [meaning Mrs. Q.] wants to know how it is done—wants to talk with some one who helps laborers to go over—some labor agent, or some one.

"Barber (interrupting). I'm the representante.

"Question. Are you the representante just for the steamship company or for the people who go over?

"Barber. Of the steamship company, but I help the people go over.

"Question. Do they go in very great numbers?

"Barber. They used to, and they are beginning to again, but it was stopped for a while. See here."

Then he stepped to the back of the shop and removed from against the wall a second huge 8-foot bill board of the Hamburg-American sailings, like the red, white, and blue one out on the street. (Exhibit II is one-third of it.) He showed us that completely hidden behind it was one of the edicts issued by the Italian Government exactly similar to the one which we had seen in the post-office, as aforesaid. (Exhibit IV.)

"Question. What kind of a thing is that?

"Barber. Oh, that comes from the government people.

"Question [pointing to the avviso near the door]. What about that?

"Barber. Oh, those are the people in New York. That's the bank there.

"Question. What's it all about? Can the signora have one of these? [pointing to the avviso].

"Barber. Yes, yes—delighted. I'm the representante of those people, too.

I then said: "The signora would like to see all the papers she can in connection with this business; she wants to know all about it."

He answered: "I have a book which has all the items—all the different towns in all the various parts of the United States and all the railroad fares to these towns."

He then went over to a cabinet and brought out a yellow-covered book about the size of an ordinary pamphlet of from 250 to 300 pages. We noticed that entire book contained, page after page, alphabetical lists of (as he said) all the small towns in the United States, with their respective counties and States, together with 6 or 7 columns of figures placed opposite the names of the towns, etc., and extending across the entire page. We could not examine the book very closely without creating suspicion, so I said:

"Can the signora have this, too?"

"Barber. Oh, no; this was just sent to me."

"Question. Have you any more copies?"

"Barber. No; I have just one; but the signora could learn a lot if she could stay here long enough. She could use this book of mine."

Mrs. Q. then said she would get one of the books and asked if she could copy the name. This I translated to the barber and he acquiesced, saying the bank would send her a copy if requested. The words on the book cover which Mrs. Q. copied were as follows:

"*Joint Tariff No. 13.* Immigrant fares from Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore. In effect May, 1906, subject to change. Immigrant Clearing House Committee. L. P. Farmer, chairman; H. C. Blye, general agent; 143 Liberty street, New York City, U. S. A. Copyright, 1906, by L. P. Farmer. Martin B. Brown & Co., printers, N. Y. C."

Resuming the conversation, I said:

"If people want to get laborers to work for them in the United States, how would they go about it?"

"Barber. They could send over the tickets?"

"Question. How would we get the tickets?"

"Barber. Go to that bank [pointing to the avvisso]. You would pay the money there and they would send the tickets to me, and I would send over the people."

I then told him of the Mr. Frank, the southern planter in Arkansas, United States, who wanted contract laborers to work on his cotton plantation; that he was about to start a new enterprise, and that in traveling through the mountains we had seen what good workers the Italians were, to which he replied that the Italians were fine laborers.

"But I don't see how you agents send them over," I insisted; and he then repeated what he had formerly said about sending the tickets in advance through the bank, saying that some of the people were too poor to pay their passage. Then he asked for Frank's address and I answered that all his mail would go to New York, to 156 Leonard street, and would be forwarded to him from there. He replied:

"It is better for Frank to see the bank or the bank to take his address and write him all information."

I told him that all matters would have to be made very plain to Frank, and in order that the signora should make no mistake he had better tell her exactly what she was to tell Frank, and then he (the barber) could write the same to the bankers, who could confirm it and also write it to Frank. I said: "Please repeat what you want Frank to send, so there will be no misunderstanding."

The Barber said: "He must send the tickets—'the biglietti'—and the bank will explain it all to the signora. Mr. Frank pays only for tickets used, and so can not lose any money."

"Question. Anything else? Is it necessary to send any money to show at the New York landing place?"

"Barber. A little money for the expenses of the voyage (spese di viaggio)."

"Question. Is that all? Of course you have to find the people. Do you pay the expenses yourself or does the steamship company pay you?"

"Barber. No, the steamship company doesn't pay. I pay everything of that kind myself."

"Question. But we're inexperienced; how much ought we to tell Frank to allow you for your trouble?"

"Barber. A little money for my expenses, what the gentleman wishes."

"Question. But how much do you think fair?"

"Barber. For men, about 10 lire each."

"Question. Do you send women?"

"Barber. Yes; women and entire families."

"Question. I forgot to ask about children. Perhaps Frank could make use of children? What about them?"

"Barber. Oh, yes. One can always use them somehow, and they won't cost much, they're just trifles, we'll throw them in for nothing."

"Question. Very little children (*piccoli bambini*)?"

"Barber (shrugging his shoulders). Oh, yes; you can use them for a good many things."

"Question. Now, the signora asks, will you write all this down for her?"

The barber then wrote out in Italian the following (the Italian writing is annexed hereto marked "Exhibit V"), and translated it is:

"Tickets—and the bank will explain it all to the signora."

"Tickets—and a little money to pay the expenses of the voyage (*spese di viaggio*)."

"Women and entire families (which he underlined)."

"10 lire per person."

Then after I had asked: "By September and October could you find a lot of laborers?" he replied very enthusiastically, "Yes, yes," and added to the paper the words: "by September and October."

"Question. Could you furnish 100 laborers?"

"Barber. Yes, yes, yes!"

"Question. Now to get these 100, do you get them yourself or will you have other agents to help you?"

"Barber. Other representante! No, I wouldn't want to ask other representante! I'll do it all myself—you know it isn't allowed! (*è proibito*). I alone can do it!"

"Question. Well, then, will it not take you a lot of time?"

"Barber. Oh, I can do it [winking and nodding his head]."

"Question. The signora asks about that sign over there [pointing to government edict]. Won't that frighten people?"

"Barber. No, No! That is finished (*è finito*)."

This was said angrily, and he then walked across the room and struck the paper with his hand, adding, "It hasn't any value! [with gestures]."

"Question. Could the signora have the paper [meaning the government paper]?"

But he did not seem to hear this and walked hurriedly across the room and got out of the cabinet a collection of other papers, as follows:

Thirty-six business envelopes advertising the Banca Luigi Alleva e Figli, 60 Mulberry street, New York City (exhibit).

Twenty-six of the "bankers" business cards reading: Luigi Alleva e Figli, 60 Mulberry street, N. Y. City, United States of America (Exhibit VI).

One of the advertisements of the Hamburg-American Steamship Company (Exhibit IV).

Two of the avvisi (Exhibit I).

Several of his own orange-colored announcements representing himself as agent (representante) (Exhibit VII).

I continued: "But that government sign. Frank, I'm afraid, will be scared when they know about it in America."

"Barber (with gestures). Oh, they know about it in America all right! That thing was sent out to me two months ago, but here I have letters that you can read which show that it has no value any more. It is all changed now! That is finished (*è finito*)."

"Question. But what if Frank doesn't know it is finished?"

"Barber (angrily). But I tell you that it is finished. Here are the letters from the bank—they say [referring to one of the letters] work is now abundant and good and 'be sure you hurry them over or they won't get the best chances.'"

He then showed us the two letters from the "Banker" Allera, dated June 7 and June 14, respectively. They were written in Italian; I read them through with the barber's help and then translated to Mrs. Quackenbos certain parts while she copied the Italian from the original. The part she copied is translated in substance, as follows (her copies from the original are annexed, marked "Exhibit VIII" and "Exhibit IX"):

"You will inform friends and acquaintances that" [word not clear] in the jurisdiction that here—the jobs—there are of them many and good of every kind—and that, therefore, those who intend to come, that they should not lose time if they do not want to do it too late."

The other letter, dated June 14, read:

"Remember that no agent or subagent in Italy possesses this book" [the barber said this referred to the yellow book "Joint Tariff No. 13 of the Immigrant Clearing House Committee" hereinbefore mentioned]. "And that, therefore, you will not allow it to be seen by no one and that you will make use of it exclusively for your own

business and for the individuals who will come over at times to my bank. As I wrote you in my other [letter] jobs go well for all those who arrive not too late. Write to me assuring me that you have received as much as (l'unio—expression not clear) and tell me all that which may be likely to interest me."

Both letters were signed "Luigi Allevi," in the same handwriting.

I noticed that the "banker" used the personal pronouns "tu," "te," and "tua," meaning "you" and "yours" in intimate discourse; the letter began "Caro Amico," which called for "tu" in the body of the writing, so I said: "Oh, he uses 'tu'—you know him well then, don't you?"

"Barber: Oh yes; he's my intimate friend." Then I pointed to the government sign again and said: "But that sign over there, won't the people be afraid to go when they read that?"

"Barber (shrugged his shoulders): Oh, it was sent out to me by the Government and we were ordered to put it up—and I put it up—but the billboard has been in front of it all the time."

By this time the man was in a rage about the government paper, and I said, "Can the signora have it for Mr. Frank?" Thereupon, he angrily tore it from the wall and exclaimed: "Yes; that's done with!" He left the upper right-hand corner of the paper still sticking to the wall. Then Mrs. Q. told me to ask:

"Do you have correspondence with the steamship company, too?"

"Barber: Yes; I correspond with them, too. Here are some of their letter heads" [crossing over to the cabinet again].

He then gave us several printed circulars of the Hamburg-American Line. [One is annexed, marked "Exhibit X."]

On the first page is a picture of a ship plying the ocean at full speed, underneath which, in large type, is the following:

"Hamburg-Amerika Line—Vapori Celerissimi Germanesi."

Next comes a list of ship sailings, etc., with blanks to be filled in (see Exhibit X), and below, in large type, are the words:

"Uffici Di Rappresentanza—Aquila—Corso Velt. Em. n. 104, Palazzi Crolina,, Aquila."

On the lower half of the same page is printed a letter, which, translated into English, is as follows (see Exhibit X):

AQUILA, ———, 190—.

RESPECTED FRIEND: Having just been informed that you have decided to depart for America, I pray you to do me the pleasure of coming to me, as representative of the Hamburg Company, if you desire to travel with the large and swift steamers of the company named, highly prized by all, and preferred especially because they offer every convenience and means of safety.

Since there exists a great crowd in these months, I recommend you to give me your order to obtain at once your passport. Regarding the making out of the documents and the securing of the passport, I place myself at your disposition, as also for the necessary information for the tribunale and for the mil-la-osta in this prefettura.

I assure you that I will use all the possible diligence and I will see that the society does the same in such a method that you will make your trip quickly, well, and with safety, aided in this also by Signori Luegi Alleva e Figli, who have in New York, at 60 Mulberry street, a banking place, and in addition have for the use of emigrants employees appointed who are able to secure for them all information and assistance.

With respect, the representative,

GIANNANGELI SALVATORE.

There is no printing on the inside pages of the sheet, but on the back side of the sheet, page 4, there is printing, arranged so that the sheet can be folded and addressed like an envelope, and when so folded reads (Exhibit XI):

"Aquila—Rappresentante, Giannangeli Salvatore—Aquila.

"Hamburg-Amerika-Linie.

"Compagnia di Navigazione a Vapore Amburghese, Amerika.

"Ill. mo Signor (To Mr.) ———,

"———."

The business envelope of the Mulberry street banker reads:

"Mr. ———, 60 Mulberry street, New York City, U. S. of America. (Care of Banca Luigi Alleva e Figli.)"

This barber labor agent was so excited over the prospect of a large order that he said to me as we left, "I will get a horse and wagon and go out in the country tomorrow and begin to get the men." This I informed Mrs. Q. of after we had left the shop, and she therefore insisted upon going back and stopping the agent from so doing.

Upon our return I told him that the signora said he need not begin upon the work yet; that he must wait a month or so until she could get the news to America, but that she would give him two months' notice before the date for which Frank wanted the labor. I asked: "Can you get it all done in two months?"

"Barber. Yes; that is enough; I can do it."

"Question. Can you get a whole hundred?"

"Barber. Yes."

"Question. Of course this isn't new business for you then; you've had practice?"

"Barber (with knowing smile). Oh, yes; I have had plenty of practice." [He took out of his pocket a book with the names of people he would canvass in the adjoining towns.]

"Question. But the signora says perhaps Mr. Frank may be anxious to have from 200 to 300. Can you get as many as that?"

"Barber. Yes. I can get as many as she wants, and in that case I would call in some of the other agents to help me, though I don't do it regularly, as it's forbidden."

The above I had translated in part to Mrs. Quackenbos throughout my interview with the barber, and she, in turn, suggested to me the above line of questioning. We left Aquila at 11.30 that night, and while in the train I reviewed the whole conversation with Giannangeli from beginning to end, and Mrs. Quackenbos wrote down in English what I told to her in detail.

ESTHER BOISE VAN DEMAN.

Sworn to before me this fourth day of August, 1909, anno Domini.

[SEAL.]

KENNETH STUART PATTON,
*Vice and Deputy Consul of the
United States of America at Rome, Italy.*

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Wednesday, March 30, 1910.

The committee met at 11.05 o'clock a. m.

Present, Messrs. Howell (chairman), Bennet, Hayes, Elvins, Burnett, Sabath, O'Connell, and Goldfogle.

STATEMENT OF MRS. MARY GRACE QUACKENBOS—Continued.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Quackenbos, will you proceed?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Mr. Chairman, I now resume my argument in favor of a more thorough system of federal distribution of immigrants, and urge upon you gentlemen the importance of reporting favorably and unanimously, I hope, this distribution bill. I urge upon you, as members of this Immigration Committee, to see to it that this bill becomes a law now, while the need for such practical and remedial legislation is so great. The question is, Shall distribution be carried on intelligently and equitably through the forces of our National Government, which has no concern with money-making interests, but acts solely for the good of the nation, or shall we permit labor agents of foreign tongue to come over and establish in our large cities purely money-making distribution concerns, such as I described yesterday. It is a matter of so much "per head" with them, and because of the fee which they hope to get they are tempted to deceive their ignorant and less enterprising countrymen. They cheat and defraud those who are already here, and they prey upon the new arrivals as soon as they land.

I will give you a few further facts as to these labor agents in New York City. I will refresh my memory from a report which was filed in the Department of Justice January 15, 1908, a report made to me by one of the assistants engaged in this work while I was directing

work in the South. It reviews some of the cases concerning employment agencies which were connected with peonage complaints. Briefly I will give the names of agents whose licenses were revoked, and I will explain why. An Italian, Pasquale Avallone, had an office at No. 96 Bayard street, New York City. There were many complaints against him. I will mention two having to do with Roumanians and Turks. On September 2, 1907, Peter Kotez, Peter Wojvodizsan, George Czarán, and four other Roumanians, arrived in this country. Three days later they were taken by an English-speaking friend to the employment office of Millitisch & Wilck, who charged them \$4 each as fee for giving them employment in Colorado where they wished to go to join some friends. The next day Millitisch & Wilck turned the men over to Avallone, receiving \$2 per man from the first agent, and giving in return a written receipt agreeing to send the men to Colorado. On September 17 complaint reached me that the men had been sent to Troy, N. Y., and had returned to this city.

They had paid to go to Colorado.

Mr. BURNETT. They had paid their fare to go to Colorado?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. No; they had paid \$4 each as a fee for obtaining employment in Colorado.

Mr. SABATH. To the agent?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes, sir [reading from the report]:

I immediately sent a special agent for these men, and I found that they had been hurriedly shipped off, because they knew we were after them, to Cuba, N. Y., a place near Buffalo. I dispatched a special employee, who brought three of them back to the city.

Several hearings were held before the commissioner of licenses, and on October 1, 1907, Avallone's license was revoked.

Another complaint against Avallone was brought by 15 Turks, who had been in the country but a few days. They were approached by a Greek runner, Nichitatis, who found that one of the Turks spoke Greek. The runner represented that he could procure employment for them in Canada, if each paid the fare of \$13.72. To this the Turks agreed. The Greek runner took the Turks to this Italian labor agent, where they met a bookkeeper, Casseleides, who confirmed what Nichitatis had said.

Mr. BURNETT. Nichitatis was a runner for the agent?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. A runner for the Italian agent; yes, sir. Casseleidis, Avallone's bookkeeper, after figuring up the total of 15 times \$13.72 showed it to Avallone, who sent the men to a nearby cafe to pay over the money to Nichitatis. All the money the men had was the sum of \$93. The leader of the Turks was one Ismael Ibraim, who alone spoke Greek, and who informed me that he had paid over the money in lump. The men were then placed upon a wagon and given contracts which showed their destination to be Flushing, N. Y., to which place the fare was 5 or 10 cents. Immediately on the revocation of Avallone's license, his manager, one Pellegrino continued the employment business at the same address, Avallone's clerk and bookkeeper, Casseleidis. Sigmund Schwartz, First street, New York, sent a number of Russian Jews to work in a sawmill in Florida. When they reached Florida the work proved to be in a turpentine camp. Schwartz had promised them land on easy terms, as well as wages, where they later could bring their families. There being a dearth of immigrants

available, by means of such a story he urged fathers of families to go down to Florida. One man had a home in New York and his children in school, but he took Schwartz's advice, seeking to better his condition. They were all held in an alleged condition of peonage. I will not go into that part now, but they came back through charity, bruised and beaten, and with the fever. The license of Schwartz was revoked on the charges we brought.

Another case was that of Louis R. Robinson. He carried on The Southern Immigration Agency in New York City. He sent Germans down to Newnan, Ga., telling them they were going to work in a furniture factory—indoor work. They were worked in a lumber mill, out of doors. Peonage was alleged. We presented the facts before the commissioner of licenses. Robinson's license was revoked.

Martin Greenfield, 112 Madison street, shipped 33 Greeks to North Platte, Nebr., on two occasions, promising work in railroad construction. He took from each man a fee of \$4; said that transportation would be free, and that food would be furnished for the long journey when they reached Chicago. No food was supplied, causing great hardships, for many were without funds. The laborers were not sent to North Platte, but to a place many miles distant, and at the end of two weeks, when wages were due, \$15, cost of transportation, was deducted from each man's earnings, leaving them sums ranging from 79 cents to 15 cents. In both instances the man who was engaged to go as interpreter was told when he reached Nebraska that no interpreter was needed. Therefore he had to do, and actually did, the ordinary pick and shovel work. After great hardship three or four men finally got back to New York, bringing with them a petition for help, written in Greek and signed by those who were compelled to remain in Nebraska.

I could go into these cases very fully and show you the sadness which attaches to each individual story. Each man is relieved of every cent he possesses and then sent somewhere, only to fool the employer, who expects to get suitable workers.

There are cases of another kind, as, for instance, three men were bound for Chicago. An agent said he would buy their tickets and put them on the train. He took \$20 apiece for the tickets, then took them down to the subway station, bought them 5-cent subway tickets, and told them these were tickets for Chicago. Another case was that of one Mellio, who arrived at the Battery after leaving Ellis Island and was met by a parasite, speaking Greek. He welcomed his countryman, expressed solicitude for his well-being, learned that Mellio was bound for the Isthmus of Panama with \$18 in his possession. He aided him in finding a steamship ticket office to purchase his ticket, and took \$18 in exchange for a time-table and a blue lithographed envelope. Such cases happen all the time in New York City.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. What do you mean by that statement, that these things happen all the time in New York City?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I mean that these "runners" and agents, many of them, are now defrauding, regularly and systematically, honest immigrants who are coming here and looking for work. I mean to say that it is absolutely a system, and it is a wheel within a wheel. To appreciate the situation, one needs only to see and hear the story

of the defrauded immigrant or laborer—Italian, Greek, Yiddish, Hungarian, German, Turkish, or Roumanian. I've had petitions for relief in all these tongues. Every case that came to our notice in the peonage work served but to emphasize the intimate relation of that crime to the labor and allied agencies. By allied agencies I refer to certain classes of hotel keepers, steamship ticket offices, boarding houses, runners, guides, and parasites of various kinds which prey upon the immigrant the very moment he lands at the Battery and soon render him the penniless victim of a cooperating labor agent.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Has not the district attorney in New York City information in regard to these matters? It strikes me these are things on which he should take action.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. These cases have come before the commissioner. You see, it is not a question of stealing their money only. When we learned of a proper case for the district attorney, we took it to him.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. If those people obtain money under false pretenses or false advice, that would come under the criminal law.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. But the point is that there is no investigator in the district attorney's office who is engaged regularly upon such work. They do not have a man down at the pier to find out these frauds.

Mr. HAYES. It might be a fraud, but it would not be obtaining money under false pretenses; there would be no false token or symbol used.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Frequently an action will lie.

Mr. HAYES. Ordinarily it would not lie.

Mr. SABATH. Charges would lie before the court.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes; for larceny; but these cases are not often discovered until too late, and the witnesses have been shipped somewhere. When I was a government attorney such facts came into the Department of Justice, and hence were part of my official duties. After investigating the facts we referred the case to the district attorney's office if there was a case for that office, and to the license commissioner if the case came within his jurisdiction.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. You said there are now about 800 men engaged in New York City in these practices?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Not just that. I will modify what I said. I do not say 800 agents are engaged in fraudulent practices, but I do say that 800 agents in New York City are regularly licensed, and that they are in business solely for their fee, and for nothing else.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Does not that apply to practically all business?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. It does apply practically to all business; but when it is proved that some of these agents have profited largely by deceiving honest workmen, and that these agents, after their licenses are revoked, continue to carry on their employment business in an unscrupulous way through another, then it proves that many of those in business solely for their fee are extremely dishonest and should therefore be placed under federal supervision in so far as they send laborers from one State to another.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Inasmuch as I am from New York City, I want to say that I would be much pleased if you would submit to me at any time the name of anyone against whom you have proof, or who is gravely suspected, of having indulged in the fraudulent practices to which you have referred.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I will be glad to do so. I shall send to you the names of those who are suspected. But as to full proof I can not promise to give you that, for I am not now employed by the Department of Justice, engaged in investigating these cases, nor do I believe that there is, at this time in New York, a Department of Justice attorney investigating. If you will put a special agent to investigate these cases, I will be very glad to aid you and give you all the information I have. In fact, if you will take this report and make it a part of your record, you will find just the situation of which I am speaking.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that when you had secured the conviction of some of these men and pointed out these frauds the State of New York did try to remedy the evil?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes; I believe so.

Mr. SABATH. And the New York state legislature has passed a new employment agency law which is a little stricter than the old one?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. You mean at this session of the legislature?

Mr. SABATH. No; the old one.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I think it was two years ago, was it not?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes, that is true; but I can not say that that was passed because of our work in the Department of Justice.

Mr. SABATH. Not entirely.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. It was passed upon the frauds that were exposed.

Mr. BURNETT. Since these exposures, and the cancellation of a lot of these licenses, have conditions improved any?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes; I will give you instances.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Before you go to that; you mentioned 800 of these people with licenses?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Licenses to conduct employment agencies, in which they charge a fee.

Mr. O'CONNELL. How many of those 800 do you know, are engaged in defrauding immigrants?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I can not give you statistics, because I have not made any statistics on that point; but if you would like me to send to the committee a list of all the licenses which have been revoked in the last year or so I will be very glad to ask the commissioner of licenses to give that information to us. It is a matter of record, I believe.

Mr. BURNETT. How many are there? Have you got it approximately?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I have not any idea, but you can easily get it by writing to the commissioner of licenses in the city of New York. Here are these cases prosecuted by the department, in which licenses were revoked.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. How many licenses have been revoked in the last two years?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I can not give an exact figure. I can add up those I know about, after going over all the department reports.

Mr. HAYES. In which you have been interested?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Not those we went out to find, but those in which the question of peonage came up. Peonage is not the usual condition in the South; it is the unusual, a localized condition, and there may have been many immigrant frauds not connected with peonage.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. You intimated very strongly that there were about 800 of these agents in the city of New York who had been guilty of fraudulent, or to put it more mildly, of questionable, practices.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Many are "questionable." I will say that.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. How many agents are there, to your belief, in the city of New York dealing in steamship tickets and acting as agents for steamship companies or procuring passage for foreigners?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. That I am not prepared to answer, because I have not made a special investigation of steamship agents.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. You see, I want to get at this.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes——

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. If there were as many as 800 in New York who were guilty of questionable practices, I would like to know how many remain that are strictly honest.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes, sir. Well, the only way that we can get at that question is to have an investigation made, and that has never been done that I am aware of.

Mr. HAYES. Excuse me; I think that Mrs. Quackenbos stated that practically all of these agencies were working in connection with agencies abroad.

Mr. SABATH. No.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. No, sir——

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. If that is so, we ought to know that now, because if there is any such wholesale conspiracy existing in my city, I for one want to know it, and I would like to inform the public authorities so that prosecutions might be set afoot; I do not care whether they are municipal or state authorities, they ought to be informed.

Mr. SABATH. One question has been asked, and some of the members of the committee would like to know about this. Did you make a statement or did you desire the committee to understand that these 800 agents, or the majority of them, work in connection with agencies abroad?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I absolutely do not. I think you misunderstood me.

Mr. HAYES. What I thought you said was a large proportion of those.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Let me make a statement, because if I am on trial here, I want to acquit myself.

Mr. O'CONNELL. You are not on trial.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes; on this point I am on trial, for I have not made it plain. Now let me make my statement clear, because I know what the truth is and I want to make it clear. There are 800 agents in New York who have licenses from the commissioner of licenses of New York. They conduct employment agencies for the hire of aliens, and they send aliens out of the city under contracts of work. They take a fee for that, generally from the alien and from the employer also. Now, many of these agents, I say, and I believe it—I am not going to tell you who or what, because I have not proved it in many cases—but I have proved it in these cases [exhibiting certain papers]—are closely connected with steamship agents who have offices abroad. I have proved it in the Aquila case, of which I spoke yesterday, and I think if you will take up such an investigation as a matter of urgent necessity, before your immigra-

tion bills come up next fall, you will find a very large number of them have their favorite steamship agents abroad with whom they work. The custom is to have cards, like in this Alleva case, which are given to the immigrant, and he is told abroad to go and see the labor agent in America. Perhaps he is a banker, as in the Alleva case, and if he is not an employment agent as well, he has some associate or friend who is an employment agent.

Mr. BURNETT. And a steamship agent.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Perhaps, but the concern in Europe is the steamship agent generally which works with the labor agent here. It is a wheel within a wheel. As my assistant has said in his report. Purposely I did not bring my own report here, but that of another person, so that I might present something to you as the evidence of somebody else. This report was made by Louis S. Posner, who is a lawyer in New York City, and is now an associate of Mr. John R. Dos Passos at 20 Broad street.

Mr. HAYES. I think I understood you correctly, and I understand it now, that many of these agents are engaged as you say. You do not know how many, but you believe a great many?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes; but I do not want Mr. Goldfogle to have the impression that there is a wholesale defrauding of the immigrants which could be seen upon the surface of things.

Mr. HAYES. Yes; but you did say a large proportion of them.

Mr. O'CONNELL. She says that she does not want to say that.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. "Many" is quite different from "all," or "a large proportion."

Mr. ELVINS. What percentage would you say?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I will not give statistics unless I am sure.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I would like to get the names and addresses of some of the men who are charged with these practices.

Mr. HAYES. You say "many;" of course, that means to me, when you say there is a total of 800 of these agents, that a large percentage of those men in New York have connections and are working as you have stated. Do you want us to understand that?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I want you to understand that I believe that it is likely, but I will not say that it is so when I have not proved what you call "a large percentage" of cases.

Mr. HAYES. That is what I understood.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. What would you say is a large percentage?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I will not name a percentage. I say I believe a large percentage. I do not say it is a fact. I say a thing is a fact that I have proved, and I have not proved a large percentage. I had to do only with those cases which came under my notice as special assistant to the Attorney-General. I can say this, that if you will read the report of the New York State Immigration Commission you will find, I believe, something upon this point. At the close of the report the commission asked Governor Hughes to appoint a state bureau for the protection of the immigrants against just such conditions as I am now stating to you. I will send you the report for this record.

Mr. SABATH. If there are 50 of these 800 men who are guilty of these fraudulent transactions, you would consider that a large proportion?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I consider that "many," yes; a large proportion to be permitted to swindle their countrymen.

Mr. SABATH. You consider that a large percentage of dishonest men?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes. I do not say that labor agents of foreign tongue are all thieves and robbers; but I say that if 50 out of 800 are guilty, if that many are thieves and robbers, it is a large percentage for Congress to ignore.

Mr. HAYES. Fifty is "a good many?"

Mr. SABATH. Of course, that is a good many.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes.

Permit me to say to you gentlemen that this grave question can not be boiled down to mere statistics. It is not a question of how much of this you will tolerate before you pass laws which will wipe out the evil. It is a question as to whether you will tolerate it at all.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Is it possible for you to give us now the names or addresses of any of such possible 50?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I can give you facts which are on file with the Department of Justice, showing those whose licenses have been revoked through proof; but as to charging others whom I have not investigated I could not do it.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I have not reference so much to those whose licenses have been revoked. They are out of business.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes; but wait a moment. Some are doing business now through other agents.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Who are the other agents?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Those names I am not willing to give before this committee, for this reason, that I should properly take the cases first to the commissioner of licenses in New York.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. That is right.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. For the revocation of their licenses. I have not come down here under any duty, but I think it not right for me, a citizen of New York, to give certain facts before this committee which I have not presented to the proper officials in my own city and State.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. But if this thing has been going on for a considerable length of time, some of the authorities must have been advised and ought to have taken action long ago.

Mr. SABATH. They have been advised in these cases.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I am not speaking of those, but of the others.

Mr. SABATH. You have not been connected with the Department of Justice for the last year?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Not for the last year.

Mr. SABATH. And therefore this is voluntary on your part?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes.

Mr. HAYES. I want to hear Mrs. Quackenbos. Let her go on.

Mr. SABATH. I just wanted to help her out.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Here is a case of the present day in which there has been as yet no prosecution. Nor am I connected with this case. Before mentioning the case, let me preface my remarks by saying that as I have procured the revocation of various licenses the impression is abroad in New York City that I am still working for the Government. I have returned from Europe; they know it; and immigrants now, when they get in trouble, try to find my office, which is

the People's Law Firm, in New York City. I received in Washington last month this telegram [exhibiting], dated February 9, 1910, from the editor of the Greek paper *Atlantis*, which reads as follows:

FEBRUARY 9, 1910.

Mrs. MARY G. QUACKENBOS,
1400 Massachusetts avenue, Washington, D. C.:

From Ferguson, S. C., we receive pitiful letters from about 50 Greeks held in bondage. They were sent by the American European Labor Bureau and their associate, C. Voicly, of 48 Roosevelt street, N. Y.

(Turning to Mr. Goldfogle.) Here is one of the names that you wanted.

We are sending you details to-night. Several begging you to investigate. Labor agents are again at work. Please write when you return.

SOLON J. VLASTO, *Editor Atlantis*.

I took the case to the Department of Justice, gave them a copy of the telegram, and sent them further facts which were addressed to me from New York by registered mail. The Attorney-General took up the case; I received a letter to that effect from the department.

Mr. BURNETT. What was this place where these Greeks were said to be held in bondage?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Ferguson, S. C. I have received the official report of the Department of Justice, dated March 4, 1910. It is given to me as a courtesy, and the department has no objection to your making this report a part of your record. Briefly speaking, they found no peonage in Ferguson; but the special agent, William R. Benham, who wrote the report, after investigation, says:

These Greeks are particularly incensed against one S. Miletich and one C. Vouly [Voicly]. They stated that said persons are jointly interested in the American-European Labor Exchange, 48 Roosevelt street, New York. They further stated that above-named persons procured their entire original party of 36 for said Santee River Lumber Company, and charged each man a fee ranging from \$2.50 to \$3 for securing said employment, and that said persons represented to them at the time they were so employed that their work was to be in the mill of said company, but on arrival at Ferguson they were put to work in the cypress swamp nearby.

Then omitting, in order not to take too much time, they complained also that the wages were not as agreed. The report goes on to say:

The work is exceedingly hard and made highly disagreeable by reason of the water which stands in said swamp a part of the time, through which the men have to wade while about their work.

It is contended that the place is very unhealthy, and that many of the workmen are stricken with fever, from which death frequently follows. Altogether, this swamp is certainly not a desirable place in which to labor, and it can readily be understood why foreigners sent there by labor agents complain when they are assigned to work therein, especially when said labor agents represented to them that the work was to be of an indoor character.

And further on he says that foreigners are now being exploited and deceived by this agency. The report reads:

It is evidently a fact that foreigners have been and now are being deceived and exploited by said American-European Labor Exchange, and that said Santee River Lumber Company is not fair in its treatment to the foreign element of its employees.

They report no charge of peonage, for the agent found that there was no peonage. Since there have been peonage prosecutions, frequently an immigrant who is shipped to do work totally different from that promised and a kind of work for which he is not suited

thinks he is in a peonage condition. He does not know what peonage is. I want to do justice to the South by saying that in many cases where immigrants are deceived peonage does not result at all; but all the trouble and difficulty arises from the misrepresentations of the agent. Of course a man complains when he pays a fee for a good job and is then sent to a kind of work for which he is not suited after having been told by the agent it was "just the thing for him." This is why I urge distribution by the National Government to leave no chance for misrepresentation.

Mr. SABATH. And that is being practiced more or less by these agents?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. And they promise them that they will have certain wages and certain work?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. And when these men arrive at the place to which they have been shipped, they find that they do not receive the amount of wages or have the kind of work that they have been informed that they were going to receive?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. That is exactly true.

Mr. SABATH. And therefore they are dissatisfied with the place and the locality, and it creates prejudice against the laborers in the district to which they are sent?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Exactly.

Mr. SABATH. Because people there are under the impression that these foreigners do not desire to work?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. That is it.

Mr. SABATH. And they do not understand the conditions, or how they were sent there?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Exactly.

Mr. SABATH. And if the people in the places to which they are sent would understand that these men had been lied to and that the work had been misrepresented also, and their wages misrepresented, they would not have so much bad feeling against these foreigners; is not that true?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. That is exactly true. You have stated the condition truly.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Sabath is testifying.

Mr. SABATH. I have devoted about four months of my time, the very first session I was in Congress here, to these complaints, and I know a good deal of fraud does exist and did exist, and it creates prejudice against the foreigner because these men will not remain to work in the places to which they are sent, when in fact they did not desire to go there in the first place and they were sent there by false representations.

Mr. HAYES. I want to hear Mrs. Quackenbos. Let her go on.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I think Mr. Sabath explains the need much better than I do.

Mr. SABATH. Oh, no; I do not; of course, we are here on my bill, and I just want to make it plain. Mrs. Quackenbos is here, and will appear again if the committee desires to hear her.

Mr. BURNETT. What are these so-called charitable associations in New York City doing to look after these people and distribute them?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. In that connection I will say that I have recently written to each one of these institutions asking information. I have not received all the answers as yet. I will be glad to put them before the committee when they come.

Mr. BURNETT. Are they aware of this exploitation of the foreigners, and are they allowing it without any effort to prevent it on their part?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I think that institutions doing honest charitable work in connection with foreigners would like to see the labor agents of whom we are now speaking put under federal supervision.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. If possible, I would like to have you answer the question put by Mr. Burnett.

Mr. BURNETT. I asked whether these institutions were allowing this wholesale exploitation by labor agencies of the people of their own country without interference on their part in any way?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I would prefer to answer that after I had investigated them; but if I must answer now without an investigation, I would say no; I would say they are engaged in their own philanthropic work, and therefore do not interest themselves in this.

Mr. BURNETT. Is it any part of their work to distribute these immigrants and send them out?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes; I think nearly all these foreign philanthropic institutions do in a certain measure distribute; but many of them house immigrants and look after their welfare while they are in the city, after they land.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Do you believe that if this deceit and misrepresentation was eliminated, it would tend to lift this prejudice which seems to exist in the South against these men who are discontented with their lot after they arrive there?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Absolutely; and I will explain it to you. If the right man is sent to the right place, he will not run away. There will be no peonage. You send the wrong man to that place, and he runs away; and then they go out and catch him and bring him back.

Mr. O'CONNELL. You think one real cause of the trouble is this misrepresentation?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes, sir; I think all the trouble starts with that. The men who are engaged in this business not only cheat their countrymen, but they fool the American employers as well. Both the workmen who are deceived and the American employer are honest. If the man was suited to the work and the employer to the man, there would be no trouble. The federal bureau makes careful selection in every case and there is never any trouble.

Mr. O'CONNELL. And that tends to create bad feeling?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes; that tends to create bad feeling.

Mr. BENNET, of New York. Is not this a fact: That an employer in the South who desires to get a particular kind of laborer for a particular kind of work in the South sends to an employment agency, say in the city of New York, an exact statement of what he wants?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes.

Mr. BENNET, of New York. And the employment agency sends him a man who is not at all fitted for that work?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. That is exactly it.

Mr. BENNET, of New York. And deceives the man whom it sends, whether he is an alien or native born?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes; the employer in the distant State is deceived, as well as the alien or native workman here. The all-important question to the agent is his fee.

Mr. BENNET, of New York. And that the employment agent deceives both the man he sends and the employer to whom he sends him?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. He does.

Mr. BENNET, of New York. And that is the reason for a great deal of this trouble?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes; if employers would get their labor through the Federal Government, a responsible agency, they would have no fee whatsoever to pay, and they would get the right men—men suited to the work and to whom the contract and all its conditions have been carefully and fully explained in advance. They would also get the particular nationality they made request for.

Mr. BENNET, of New York. And a man who was not deceived.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. Do you know how many of the 350,000 immigrants that have arrived in this country this distribution bureau has sent out in the last twelve months?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. You mean the federal bureau?

Mr. BURNETT. The distribution bureau of which Mr. Powderly is the chief?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I do not know exactly, but I have here Mr. Powderly's reports.

Mr. BURNETT. It is less than 5,000, is it not?

Mr. SABATH. I can give you the reason why.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I will file the reports of the Division of Information; the reports of 1908 and 1909. They will show all the work which has been done. I think the division has been in existence but two years.

Mr. BENNET, of New York. Yes; two full years.

Mr. BURNETT. Should those reports be printed in the record?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. If it will make the record too voluminous, I will mark certain extracts for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; you may do that.

(The extracts referred to will be found appended to this hearing.)

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. In line with what Mr. Bennet has said, I want to place on record the card of Labor Agent Schwartz, who before his license was revoked did a rushing and remunerative business. Let me read what Schwartz promised to do.

S. S. Schwartz's Labor Agency, 113-115 First street, New York, between avenue A and First avenue. Best known and largest agency in the United States. Any number or nationality of skilled or unskilled laborers furnished. Newly landed foreigners always on hand. Contractors supplied at short notice. Licensed under \$1,000 bond.

Telegram: Schwartz's Labor Agency, 133-115 First street.

Hungarian, Polish, Swedish, Norwegian, French, Italian, Greek, Irish, and Finlandish laborers arrive every week from Europe.

Kindly call at once at my office to engage a gang of shortly landed foreigners. (Not spoiled from city life.) My office fees are reasonable. Let me hear from you soon, or tell your friends to send their orders. Yours, truly, S. S. Schwartz, labor agent, New York.

You will note that he says in parentheses "Not spoiled from city life." That is a hint that he will get you the kind of stranger that you can control.

On his card he had an American flag in one corner and his picture in the other. Frequently there is a picture of a large ship in full sail and the brawny arm of a workman about to strike the hammer.

But I think we have dwelt long enough upon the subject of the agents.

I would like to state what the Federal Government is doing in distribution and to draw a contrast if possible—for there is a sharp contrast to be considered. Mr. Powderly, who is chief of the division, stated to me in conversation that it was the purpose of the division to know where every available acre of land is to be had in the United States, what that land will produce, the kind of crops, the number per year, the climatic conditions, the proximity to lines of transportation, rail or water, the nearest markets for produce, the terms on which the land can be had, the conditions as to churches, schools, banking facilities in the neighborhood, and everything which a man going to a new place to make a home would want to know. This was the foundation which he laid for accurate knowledge of conditions into which he would later distribute workers and settlers. I think it is an excellent idea. Some thought it a stupendous work and tried to discourage him, but Mr. Powderly seems to be an admirable leader in this distribution system.

Both Mr. Powderly and Mr. Green, his assistant in New York, who is extremely well qualified for the work, believed that the collection of such a mass of information was not a hard thing to do, but easy to do when one wanted to do it, and so they have laid a splendid foundation for distribution. I will say this much, gentlemen: I have never been connected with the bureau and I want to see it prosper chiefly because their work if broadened will eliminate the frauds, and I believe it a patriotic movement, thus bringing together intelligently the unemployed and working opportunities. They have made an excellent start, and, to my mind, the interests of this nation demand that this bureau be given a wider scope for its work, for no agency so well as a government agency can distribute labor equitably without regard to sect or creed or political party. The Division of Information, however, can not do this great work alone; they need cooperation with the Post-Office and Agricultural departments, and this, I believe, they are receiving to some extent. With even a broader cooperation of these departments the division will be in a position to know all there is to know about the agricultural and industrial conditions throughout the country and the conditions for settlers. They will be acquainted with the situation and the need for labor in even the remotest towns. It seems most important and valuable to centralize such a mass of information and a convenience to employers to have a central bureau in which to file it. The division is now in touch with every subpostal station in the United States. Through these post-offices the farmers report to the division as to how many men they want, whether farmers or farm hands, and of what nationality. But what is the use of such information if it is not given to some one who will be benefited by it? At this point I think it very important that you put on record these printed forms which the division of information sends out. Here are forms for farm laborers, for settlers, for domestics, for reporting local conditions, and so on.

(The forms referred to are appended to this hearing.)

Mr. SABATH. When you say for "settlers," you mean for immigrants who come here and are ready to settle and buy land?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Ready to do so.

Mr. SABATH. Who have money enough with them to buy land?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes. Doctor Stella, of New York, who was the official delegate from the Italian Government to the Congress on Tuberculosis in Washington, states that nine-tenths of the Italians who come from southern Italy come from the rural districts. He says that 77 per cent remain in the cities, but a large number have no opportunity of getting away. The situation has come to be unwholesome in New York. People should be distributed, because of tenement congestion, tuberculosis, and because there are hundreds of farms that are lying idle for want of labor. The Italian Government, I believe, would aid in the distribution of Italians into rural districts if they were requested so to do, and I doubt not but that other governments would also be glad to cooperate. I have received such personal assurances.

Mr. BURNETT. In this country?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes; in this country. I do not like to speak of my own writings, but I have outlined just how this can be done in a pamphlet which I will make a part of this record if you wish it.

Mr. BENNET, of New York. Yes; in the steerage of every ship coming from Italy there is posted up advice to the immigrants to go on farms, and a statement as to where they can receive information in the United States as to how to get onto the farms.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I am glad to hear this. Now, I asked Mr. Powderly yesterday to give me, roughly, the number of persons which the bureau has dealt with—both employers and employees. He could not give a figure without going over the records. He must also receive from his superiors permission to give such testimony. I understand the applications at the New York branch have been numerous, but I would urge you strongly to call Mr. Powderly and also the New York manager, Mr. Green, before this committee.

Mr. BURNETT. And only sent out a little over 4,000?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I have investigated why. In the beginning Mr. Powderly, instead of rushing numbers, began by laying the foundation, as I said, for getting accurate information and inspiring confidence in the employers, as well as in the applicants for work. During the administration of the former Commissioner-General of Immigration distribution was commenced carefully and wisely, so that the information, the getting of which took the nation's money, was used to benefit the nation, to develop the resources of the nation. It bore fruit in the shape of farm hands where farm hands were needed, common laborers where pick and shovel men were needed, and settlers in States which welcome the surplus population of the East. But lately the work has been unduly restricted to agriculturists and domestics. I say "unduly" because I believe it is "unduly" restricted. Now, farm hands are not wanted at all seasons of the year, and it must be made a popular thing to introduce the agricultural spirit into immigrants already in cities. The States must cooperate with the national bureau. The laws against overcrowding must be enforced in the cities. Overcrowders must be practically forced out in the beginning, whether they like it or not, and by and by when they get into the country their condition will be

bettered, and they will understand and gradually draw away their countrymen from the tenements. Arriving aliens will then want to go where their countrymen are, and life in rural districts in America will be more attractive. It is to my mind better to distribute all classes now and induce as many as possible to leave city life. But I think it is a mistake to cut out part of the work.

Mr. BURNETT. Cut out by order of Mr. Keefe?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I really do not know. I think it is by order of the Secretary, the head of the department, is it not, Mr. Bennet?

Mr. BENNET, of New York. I am not sure myself.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Perhaps Mr. Nagel leaves that work to Mr. Keefe, and Mr. Keefe issues the order. I have not had the impertinence to ask, but I should think the man at the head of the department is the only one who could cut down the work. The law says the division must promote "a beneficial distribution of aliens." It does not specify the kind of work.

Mr. BURNETT. And this applies to domestics?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes; they distribute domestics, but not many. The bill before us seeks to broaden the scope of the division and establish twelve government agencies throughout the United States. It provides for the distribution of agriculturists and kindred workers, settlers, domestics, and common laborers. In each exchange there could be a woman's department as well, which would be a good thing if managed by a woman of experience. She could carry out an intelligent plan to place women where work is, teach them how to seek work, where to go, where to board while awaiting work, etc. This would safeguard helpless women and protect them from the viciousness of white-slave dealers. I believe the report of the Congressional Commission on Immigration shows that many of the white-slave cases were brought about by bad agents in this country. I am referring to cases where women, arriving here as immigrants or even citizens, are sent by these agencies to the white-slave dealers. Is that not so, Mr. Bennet?

Mr. BENNET, of New York. Yes.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. So that I would strongly recommend these women's branches. I do not see any immediate necessity of making a point of distributing domestics, but domestics could in time be distributed beneficially to places where their countrymen have been sent to work or have settled. The act of February 20 reads: "It shall be the duty of the division to promote a beneficial distribution of aliens throughout the States and Territories desiring immigration." I should think that all workers who want to be distributed would have a right to be distributed under this law. It does not say there shall be a beneficial distribution of agriculturists and domestics only. Department regulation seems to have changed the spirit and intent of the law which you passed in 1907. Therefore I would urge you to provide in this law for the distribution of common laborers also, for the bulk of our immigration and those I am asking you to save from the clutches of the labor sharks are the common laborers. Skilled laborers also might be distributed by this bureau, but we do not mention them here, because they are supposed to be distributed through their unions. But I see no reason why their unions should not cooperate in this work, as they do so heartily with the German Government labor exchanges.

Mr. BURNETT. There is no provision in the law against distributing common laborers as it now stands?

Mr. SABATH. The law is not enforced, and, furthermore, the Commissioner of Immigration is unfriendly to such a distribution.

Mr. HAYES. It may come from a belief in his mind, as I confess it is in my mind, that nearly all immigrants have a contract of employment, or an understanding for employment, before they start from abroad.

Mr. SABATH. You are wrong.

Mr. HAYES. And there is no seeking to have labor come here where there is no demand for it.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. If all immigrants come here under a contract of employment, as Mr. Hayes says, then it is the duty of the Department of Commerce and Labor and the Department of Justice to prosecute these cases, for the law is violated. The cutting down of the number or kind to be distributed after they are admitted has nothing to do with that question. I urge you to pass this law, because it provides explicitly for investigation and the punishment of all those who introduce labor in that way. It brings the facts in such cases under a review by the Federal Government.

Mr. BURNETT. About what is the cost, if you know, of this division of distribution?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I do not know the annual cost of the whole division, but Mr. Bennet can give us that.

Mr. BENNET, of New York. It is \$30,000 a year.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. In New York I think it costs \$30 a day. I investigated this agency while I was investigating the other employment agencies. I found nothing against it but much in its favor, and you know I should not have hesitated to come here and state that the federal agency was defrauding aliens if it had been so doing. If I was not convinced that it was doing excellent work, and did not believe that it could be made very efficient if its scope was broadened, I should not have wasted eight months abroad and six months here trying to aid distribution through government channels.

Mr. SABATH. I know this, that before Mr. Keefe was made Commissioner of Immigration arrangements were made by the old immigration inspector for a bureau in Chicago, and all the arrangements had been made, and the man had been assigned to it, a gentleman by the name of Crawford, and within a few weeks after Mr. Keefe was in office the matter was eliminated.

Mr. BURNETT. Let me ask you how many were distributed the year before he became commissioner?

Mr. SABATH. The bureau has been created only a few years; they just started to work—that is, to get the matters in shape—and they were really not ready to do any effective work.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. May I answer that?

Mr. BURNETT. They have been in existence three years the 30th of this coming June.

Mr. SABATH. Three years; yes. This is the third year.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes.

Mr. HAYES. On the 30th of June it will be three years.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. The first year it distributed 2,099 workers, and there was not a complaint against it, which is very great testimony, I think, in its favor, because it had to be sure that not one of those

2,099 laborers went away under misrepresentation or mistake, and they had to be reasonably sure that the places were those for which these men were suited. This past year they distributed 5,000, I think, was it not? It is in their report.

Mr. BURNETT. No; it was something over 4,000.

Mr. HAYES. I think it should be stated, in defense of the administration of Mr. Keefe, that of course he had nothing to do with the policy of the department, and whatever is done in regard to this is done by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Keefe does not control the policy of the department.

Mr. BURNETT. Four thousand one hundred and sixty-eight immigrants were placed in employment through this bureau.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. That is a large number when you eliminate the distribution of common laborers. The great bulk of our immigrants are common laborers, and they have not distributed any of those during the past year; their work was cut down. If they had had permission, I suppose you would call it, or department sanction, to distribute common laborers such as the law provides for, I feel confident their numbers would be way up in the tens of thousands.

Mr. BURNETT. How many common laborers were distributed before Mr. Keefe took charge of the bureau?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. The majority were common laborers, I believe; but we will get that from the report.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Keefe has not been in but a year, and that ought not to be held against him.

Mr. HAYES. These two reports were before he came in.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. We are not saying anything against Mr. Keefe, whom I know. He has always been very courteous to me. I think if this law were passed, providing for bureaus in all the large cities, he would be willing to have the entire work broadened. If not, I think he would be willing to come down here and state why, because this is an important question.

I call your attention to this pamphlet which your committee has issued as a public document, containing, as it reads, 93 letters from governors of various States, boards of trade, railroad presidents, Cardinal Gibbons, and many other persons of standing in the community. The testimony contained in these letters in answer to the question—

In your opinion, would an intelligent distribution of immigration under the direction of the federal authorities, in conjunction with those of the various States, tend to offset the evils of alleged excessive immigration—

seems to me to be the most eloquent testimony as to whether there is need for distribution throughout the country.

The sum total of the answers was this:

That a comprehensive plan of distribution, under the direction of the federal authorities, in cooperation with those of the various States, is most desirable and would tend to obviate the evils of congestion in our larger cities.

Mr. ELVINS. How many answers were there to that?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. There are quite a number of them.

Mr. ELVINS. Most of them are from real-estate and railroad people?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I found quite a number of them that were not. I thought various governors answered affirmatively. The letters are

tabulated. It is your own document, and you ought to know about it; but I found quite a number—quite a large number—who heartily indorsed federal distribution in cooperation with the various States.

Germany has solved this question of the unemployed by establishing government exchanges in all its large cities. Berlin has two such exchanges with buildings like this [indicating photograph]. A sort of workingmen's clubhouse, in which the employer can meet the worker and where there are many workers to select from, and all the information as to the nature and conditions of work is centralized.

Mr. BURNETT. That is only for their own people, is it not?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Of course they mainly work for their own people, but many of the so-called wandering workmen become stranded in Germany.

Mr. BURNETT. Is it not true that they will not let them stay there in their own country, but send them out?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. They are on their way out, as they come. I suppose.

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. But these immigrants of ours—they are “our own people” here—because they are of different nationalities, they are no less “our own people” after they are admitted into this country. Therefore I think the question is the same. Perhaps our work is harder to do and broader, for we have a greater responsibility in dealing with so many nationalities, but that is all the greater reason why we should do it intelligently, efficiently, and equitably.

The Berlin exchange has a great assembly hall where workers can be gathered together in sufficient numbers to permit of intelligent discrimination. The Division of Information, the distribution bureau of our great United States Government, has a little basement at No. 17 Pearl street, New York City, with three dark, miserable rooms, not half as good as many of the foreign agencies, and not at all inviting to a man looking for work nor to an employer seeking laborers. And in addition to that handicap the manager's efforts are restricted as to whom they shall send out. A man—a common laborer, just the one who needs government direction most—comes looking for a job and is told: “We can not give you any information; we can not distribute laborers unless they are agriculturists.” I know this because I have investigated it, and the result is that these laborers are turned away from a place which charges no fee and which could give them accurate information, and they have to go to those agencies which have the enormous signs and which promise a laborer anything and everything and treat him as so much merchandise. They pay a fee and they get defrauded, and some American employer is defrauded along with the immigrant in the same way.

Mr. BURNETT. Are most of those agencies in New York also in the immigrant bank business?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Yes; a large number of them. And some have a post box in front of the agency, and the immigrant, especially the Italian, sees the post box and supposes that the bank also is a government institution.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Do you mean here?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. In New York.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. You say in New York. Do you mean in other places also?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I do not know; I presume it is the same in other places.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I do not like to have the distinction made that these things are only in New York.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Well, of course, Mr. Goldfogle, neither do I. I am also a New Yorker, you know; but if we know such truths about our city we must keep pegging away until we've improved conditions.

Mr. Garner, who is a Representative from the anthracite fields of Pennsylvania, has introduced a bill in the House for better distribution. He wants an information labor office in each and every post-office in the United States. He recognizes the need for better distribution and bringing employers in touch with those desiring employment.

The Secretary of Agriculture, after reading my plan, writes the following letter, which I will read and place on record:

I highly approve of what you are endeavoring to do.

One reason for the high price of everything the American consumer eats is the lack of sufficient help to enable the farmers of the United States to produce more. It would be good for these people to get them distributed through the country among the producers on the farm, and it would be good for the country to have them there. The authority for doing work along this line rests with the Department of Commerce and Labor.

Mr. BURNETT. Is not the American farmer producing more than he ever has produced?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. But there are thousands of acres idle, and, according to Mr. James J. Hill, we need many more producers. The would-be producers are in New York living in the tenement houses. There are over 114,000 tenement houses in New York, and much of the foreign population herding there is composed of natural tillers of the soil. Without opportunity and aid they must remain in the tenement—to crowd and breed disease.

The report of the New York committee on tuberculosis says:

The tuberculosis situation in New York is critical. The great danger to the community is from the uninstructed careless consumptive in his tenement home.

There are in New York City to-day—

44,000 known consumptives.

28,000 uncared for now.

24,000 new cases each year.

20,000 have died from consumption in two years.

Mr. BURNETT. Is that among aliens only?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. No; among all people, but principally among the tenement-house population, which is an alien population.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. You say the tenement-house population is mostly alien population; that is not so. They are mixed.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I thought the tenement population was largely made up of aliens.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. No; they are mixed.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Well, you must know, Mr. Goldfogle, if you represent any of the tenement districts.

The point is that we Americans are exploiting the aliens, for while our federal laws are excellent for keeping them out of the country we show a noticeable lack of interest in them after they are admitted and we let them drift. They want to work and we ought to have government labor exchanges to help them get the work that they can do. I want to say in behalf of our immigrants, that I believe

they are absolutely well-meaning, and if the American Government would show the least interest in them and expend the necessary money and activity in getting them into the localities where they can work and where they can by their work give satisfaction to their employers, upon which point I can give you much testimony in their favor, you will find no trouble with them. Down in the Jewish section of New York arriving aliens are taught not only to work but to be good citizens, and they are not taught by Americans either, but by Jews. They are instructed in our laws. I know of no other section where immigrants are taught by their own people to become good citizens of our nation.

Mr. BURNETT. Are there many of them without employment there now?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I can not give you the statistics on that, but I think that the applications at the charities would show that there were many.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I would like to make this observation: You said there was no other section of New York City where immigrants are taught to become good citizens, except in the Jewish section. Permit me to correct you in that; there are many institutions in the city of New York where a great deal of the work is directed toward the Americanization of the immigrants.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. Are they instructed in the laws of the United States?

Mr. O'CONNELL. That is school work.

Mr. BENNET, of New York. You mean in the high schools?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I mean in the schools generally.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I mean that these Jewish immigrants are taught by men of their own nationality, by the best people of their own nationality, who donate money for this work and try to make them good citizens—much better citizens than we try to make of them.

Mr. BENNET, of New York. Yes.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. My personal observation, and it has been large, indeed, is that we have a large number of institutions, including our educational institutions, which make it a point to educate the immigrants and cause their assimilation as rapidly as possible, and make efforts in a variety of ways to Americanize them, and do that work well.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. And yet, Mr. Goldfogle, the tenement conditions still remain.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Tenement conditions will always, I am afraid, remain in large cities.

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. It seems to me that distribution will solve the tenement conditions.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Yes; no doubt.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Do not a large number of these people come from agricultural communities in the Old World, and come here because they are tired of agricultural conditions and do not want to continue in them any longer, but would prefer to go into mechanical and manufacturing centers where different talent is to be developed in them? Is there not on the part of the immigrant himself a desire to enter into a different form of life than that in which he has lived?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I think the answer to that question is this: The immigrant hears the story of America abroad; it takes his fancy;

from what he is told, he thinks it must be heaven. One poor man in Mississippi told me the steamship agent said that in America the boss would hang a large piece of meat on his door every morning. He believes what he is told. One place is just as good as another to him. One kind of work as good as another, if his beloved countryman is in that place or is doing that work. If the steamship agent made agriculture popular with them, they would engage in agriculture; but when they are told that they can pick up money in the city streets, so to speak, and that they can make this and that fabulous wage per day, and when their countrymen are crowded into 114,000 tenement houses, as they are in New York City, they come over, too, to share those identical conditions. They are the only conditions they know about.

The immigrant isn't designing at all. He doesn't assert himself and say what he is going to do. He just takes what he gets, and if he is disappointed he tries to save up enough to get away as soon as possible. That is largely why he takes his money home. Most of them, I believe, would like to have a home if they could get one, but when they are not helped they get discouraged; quite naturally, too. If we make it pleasant for the alien when he comes, and send him to a suitable place away from New York, I believe he'd be contented and stay. It is worth a trial, anyway.

Mr. O'CONNELL. If manufacturing conditions gave him more hope for that, why should there be a tendency to keep him in the agricultural class?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. To my mind there should not be any such tendency—the Division of Information should not be restricted.

Mr. SABATH. This bill would modify conditions, and if the immigrants were needed in the factories, they would be sent there, and if they were needed in agriculture, they would be sent to agricultural districts.

Mr. ELVINS. And in that way, by sending them out to agricultural communities you could produce more?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. That is the opinion of some people, and it is certainly mine, that there is plenty of land and few producers.

Mr. ELVINS. Do you not think we could improve conditions by having fewer people to consume?

Mrs. QUACKENBOS. I think we must solve the problems that confront us now. The question is, What shall we do with the surplus population already admitted? The Government should, as the law provides, distribute this surplus, beneficially, among the States and Territories desiring immigration; the question of our future immigration must then be settled in another way.

Mr. SABATH. I wish to put in the record these figures. Under this distribution bureau 5,008 have been given employment and 26,477 have received information from the bureau. I submit herewith an outline of a plan for better distribution, written by Mrs. Mary Grace Quackenbos and published in the March (1910) number of *The Editorial Review*; also extract from same *Review*.

(At 11.55 o'clock a. m. the committee adjourned.)

[Extract from The Editorial Review for the month of March, 1910, page 231, submitted by Mr. Sabbath.]

"Distribution, the solution of the immigrant and tuberculosis problems," by Mary Grace Quackenbos, offers a method of ameliorating the conditions resulting from the congestion of our immigrant population. The article is written not only from a broad knowledge and study of statistics, but from wide practical experience, and consequently carries conviction. To overcome some of the evils and obstacles and bring about an equitable and efficient system of distribution Mrs. Quackenbos has proposed a distributing plan based upon experience in European countries and which seems to be a feasible one for this country. It involves the cooperation of the States and Territories with the United States Government, and likewise that of foreign governments. Mrs. Quackenbos has practiced law for the last six years, directing her energies toward aiding distressed aliens and others unable to pay the ordinary fees for competent legal services. As one of the attorneys for the Legal Aid Society, she has worked in New York's lower East Side courts. Five years ago Mrs. Quackenbos founded The People's Law Firm, a philanthropic institution of which she is the head. While carrying on this work, aided by a staff of lawyers, in which she acquired an intimate acquaintance with the tenement-house conditions on the East Side of New York, she was appointed special assistant to the Attorney-General for the United States at Washington, and was engaged for months in peonage cases. She was thus brought into personal touch with the labor question of great centers of population like New York, and also of the South, and realized how the proper distribution of immigrants would ameliorate conditions in the crowded cities of the North and meet the labor needs of the South. Resigning her position as Special Assistant Attorney-General, she went to Europe at her own expense to study the immigrant question at first hand. Visiting the most remote provinces of southern and middle Europe, studying the home environment of the peasants from whom the immigrant class is so largely drawn, Mrs. Quackenbos gives authoritative information and the article will be read with especial interest at the present time when the problems treated are claiming particular attention and earnest study at the hands of legislators, scientists, and social reformers.

Article from the Editorial Review for the month of March, 1910, pages 243-251. Submitted by Mr. Sabbath, a member of the committee.]

DISTRIBUTION, THE SOLUTION OF THE IMMIGRANT AND TUBERCULOSIS PROBLEMS— BY MARY GRACE QUACKENBOS.

Two problems of immediate importance to the National Government and to the States present certain questions of public policy which, sooner or later, must be met by practical and uniform legislation. They are the immigrant and tuberculosis problems, and are so closely related that the solution of the one means the ultimate eradication of the other.

The appalling number of deaths from tuberculosis is directly traceable to the enormous herdings of population. This is strikingly indicated in the report of the New York committee on tuberculosis.

"The tuberculosis situation in New York is critical. The great danger to the community is from the uninstructed careless consumptive in his tenement home."

Statistics for New York City to-day show 44,000 known consumptives, 28,000 uncared for now, 24,000 new cases each year, 20,000 deaths from consumption in two years.

Immigration, adding continually to the congestion, has reached abnormal proportions, and it is now a matter of vital and urgent necessity to reduce this congestion and divert from tenements to rural districts the inpouring throngs.

Last year 256,425 admitted aliens gave their destination as New York; this was 32 per cent of the entire number admitted; over 64 per cent went to five Northern States, leaving but 36 per cent to scatter themselves over all the remaining portions of our vast country. Of these, 112,816 were either farmers, farm laborers, or had no occupation, and could therefore have been utilized in agricultural work. Yet they remained in cities while millions of acres of farm lands throughout the country lay uncultivated and abandoned.

Distribution is the efficient remedy for both the tuberculosis and immigrant evils. This was recognized by Congress when, on February 20, 1907, it established a national bureau—the Division of Information. The act reads:

"It shall be the duty of said division to promote a beneficial distribution of aliens admitted into the United States among the several States and Territories desiring immigration."

The most efficient distribution plan is manifestly one in which the idea of cooperation between the United States Government and the States is emphasized by permitting representatives of the States to have a voice in the enterprise; and still further emphasized as to cooperation between the States and the immigrant masses, by permitting representatives of the latter also to have a voice in the enterprise.

The industrial and agricultural boards of the various States seeking to attract settlers and workers to develop their resources are meeting with hindrances which may be summarized as follows:

1. It is difficult to induce aliens to move from cities where they are held by the natural attraction between countrymen.
2. Aliens lack confidence in strangers who urge them to go to a strange place under conditions vouched for by no one whom they know.
3. Aliens lack the means to pay for transportation.
4. There are no large central bureaus where workers may be collected in sufficient numbers to permit intelligent discrimination and selection for the various classes of work.

To overcome these difficulties a plan is here submitted which is believed to be workable and feasible, and the law above quoted may stand as its basis.

I. MOVING ALIENS TO PREVENT OVERCROWDING IN CITIES.

There are tenement-house laws in most of our States especially designed to guard against overcrowding. The New York State law reads:

"No room in any tenement house shall be so overcrowded that there shall be afforded less than 400 cubic feet of air to each adult, and 200 cubic feet of air to each child under 12 years of age."

Enforcement of such a law is more urgent than is new legislation. In this manner there will be made available for distribution many of the multitude now living in the 102,000 tenements of New York City. In any event, and what is of equal importance, it will prevent arriving masses from settling in already overfilled sections,^a thus safeguarding them from disease, and increasing the number of distributed workers. When groups of newcomers settle in distant States their countrymen will be gradually drawn away from the tenements.

A strengthening of the present laws and their stricter enforcement might well be considered in recognition of their immediate relation to tuberculosis; appropriations for state health inspectors would ultimately be cheaper than the expense of meliorating the evils which their vigilance would prevent.

II. REASSURING ALIENS.

Aliens should be helped to find work for which they are fitted,^b and should be protected from fraud. While our federal laws are excellent for keeping undesirables out of the country there is a noticeable lack of government protection for aliens admitted. They are suspicious, confused, unfamiliar with the new conditions, and unwilling to trust strangers who urge them to unknown and distant places. Thus they remain segregated and grouped in cities, a prey to padrones, pseudobankers, swindling labor agents and "white-slave dealers." They can not easily distinguish between these frauds and the honest inducements offered by state industrial representatives.

We have no central well-equipped labor exchange in the United States under recognized government auspices—such as one sees in Germany—devoted exclusively to the dependent classes, where illiterate foreigners can find employment and have a voice in choosing their work, aided by representatives of their own government. In such they place great confidence.

Foreign government representatives are best able to distribute the alien masses here, whose characteristics they understand. Knowing the conditions from which they come these representatives can judge of those to which they should be sent, and in this manner entire families can be induced to settle in places where they are most needed.

^a The committee on congestion of population reports: "New York City has the greatest congestion in the civilized world." Doctor Stella, official delegate of the Italian Government to the Tuberculosis Congress at Washington, says: "While nine-tenths of Italians who emigrate to the United States come from rural districts of Italy, 77 per cent crowd in cities."

^b Labor agents, working for their commissions and not for the welfare of immigrants, have frequently sent tailors to a mine, masons to a cotton plantation, etc., while the natural farmers work in sweat shops and live in New York tenements.

International cooperation.

The Division of Information should procure the cooperation of foreign associates whose aid is obviously so essential. It is believed this could be obtained without new legislation. The act of February 20, 1907, authorizes the President, with the advice of the Senate, to enter into international agreements with foreign governments to regulate immigration matters. If practicable, the President might extend an invitation to each foreign nation to send a number of workers—not more than two or three—to act as associates with the manager of the division.

When an order for Italian workmen comes to our American manager, he could request the Italian associate to move as speedily as possible the particular number of Italians required; Greeks could be moved by a Greek; Hungarians by a Hungarian, etc. The salaries of the foreign associates, paid by their respective governments, would be insignificant as compared with the expense these governments are now under in maintaining and returning those who become helpless from tuberculosis and other causes.^a

III. ASSISTED TRANSPORTATION.

Another serious difficulty in distribution can be lightened if the States will provide the means for transporting aliens who settle within their borders. A man must go to work the day after he arrives; he can not afford to spend his \$25 in railroad fare, so he remains in the city tenement indefinitely. When work is scarce he may become a public charge, or worse.^b If there is opportunity for him in the West or South and he lacks traveling expenses there should be some fund available from which he could borrow a sufficient amount at a moderate rate of interest; or a cooperative system might be patterned after one in operation between the government of New South Wales, the transportation companies, and Great Britain.

Assisted passages in New South Wales.

Persons living in England's tenements are helped to emigrate to New South Wales by means of "assisted passages" which are purchased by the New South Wales government from the steamship companies at reduced rates and given gratis to thousands of applicants who otherwise would be unable to leave the cities. The central office at London is in charge of a general agent who receives all applications for labor, and obtains through the labor agent of New South Wales information concerning conditions, wages, etc., there. At Sidney incoming workers are met by the state labor agent and sent forward to their proper destinations. Those entering agricultural pursuits are granted liberal concessions.

New South Wales has recognized the economic value of the system and is contributing £25,000 for "assisted passages." According to a recent report emigration has now resolved itself into the number of berths available on each outgoing steamer, there being about three would-be emigrants to each berth. Over one-third of last year's applicants were "nominated passengers;" that is to say, they were nominated by friends previously assisted who had found work advantageous in New South Wales.

^a Foreign consuls return to Europe many persons suffering and dying with tuberculosis. Doctor Stella says: "To prove that tuberculosis instead of being imported is contracted by immigrants in this country, among 309,503 Italians immigrants who left Italy for the United States in two years there were but two cases of tuberculosis (due to the strict vigilance of the United States Government). Among those homeward bound during the same two years, there were 457 in the ships' hospitals with tuberculosis, besides 17 who died at sea."

Return passages were supplied by the Italian Benevolent Institute of New York, in five years, to 973 emigrants; about one-third of these were men afflicted with tuberculosis.

From August 1 to September 17, 1909, 59 Italians, suffering from tuberculosis, were returned to Naples from the United States. The situation is similar with respect to other countries in Europe.

^b During the year 1907-8 there were 49,454 aliens detained in charitable reformatory and penal institutions of the North Atlantic and North Central States, while only 3,487 were thus detained in the South Atlantic and South Central States, and 7,051 in the Western States.

New South Wales system applied in the United States.

A similar cooperative plan can be adopted here. The legislatures of each State and Territory could appropriate a special fund to be used when necessary for assisted transportation of admitted aliens. A state labor agent could be appointed in each State and Territory to study and make record of industrial and agricultural conditions there. These state agents could meet and select an agent-general to represent the States collectively in the Division of Information at New York, and to whom requests for labor could be forwarded. Data concerning working opportunities could be gathered by him from the labor agents of the respective States, and filed in the division with the general manager. Assisted passages could be procured through this agent-general. Should assisted transportation be regarded as a loan, the amount advanced could be collected in installments from the alien's wages and returned to the State, either by the state labor agent or consular agent residing in the locality.

This plan merely emphasizes the idea of cooperation and adds but one new element. The Division of Information now exists under the act above quoted, the various States have their agricultural and industrial boards and their election of a representative is a simple matter. Little argument is needed to establish that the economic value of bringing workers within a State will far outweigh the cost of assisted passages. The new and essential element is that of foreign cooperation and favorable assurances in this regard have already been obtained from high officials abroad. It is believed that little difficulty may be expected, since other countries have already developed similar systems and appreciate their value.

In this connection it is interesting to study Germany's efficient system of bringing together the unemployed and working opportunities.

IV. THE CENTRAL LABOR EXCHANGE AT BERLIN.

In Berlin two substantial five-storied brick and stone buildings—large enough to accommodate 4,000 persons at one time—are devoted entirely to the unemployed. These are open in spring, summer, and autumn from 7 a. m. to 6 p. m., and in winter from 8 a. m. to 6 p. m. Men and women while waiting for work are comfortably housed in large, well-lit, attractive assembly halls.

The exchange puts to work from 250 to 400 persons daily. In one year alone employment was found for 95,678 men and women, while providing shelter for 158,098.^a All this is carried on at a cost of £5,000 a year, £3,000 of which is government subsidy and £2,000 the contribution of applicants and trade unions. The machinery is simple and there are but 27 workers on the staff. The work is divided into three departments—for unskilled working men and boys, for women and girls, and for skilled labor. Any person needing employment may apply to the exchange and pay a fee of 2½d., entitling him to a membership card for a period of three months.

Departments for unskilled labor.

The spacious assembly hall devoted to unskilled labor resembles the trading floor of a stock exchange. There daily from 1,200 to 1,500 men, awaiting work, sit smoking, chatting, or reading newspapers, grouped near various sign-posts labeled "teamsters," "common laborers," "farmers," "masons," etc., describing the kind of work for which they are adapted. These groups are subdivided by signs reading "January, February, March," indicating the date at which the various workers filed applications. The manager, in his office at one side of the hall, receives orders for laborers by messenger, letter, and telephone. At intervals throughout the day he enters the hall, raps for silence, and reads aloud these orders; the waiting workers eagerly hand up their membership cards; the manager carefully selects those most competent, giving preference to the ones who have waited longest and who have families dependent upon them. In separate rooms the workers can meet prospective employers. No pressure is exercised, but the terms of employment are fully explained. One who is not engaged, or who refuses the job, may recover his membership card and resume his place upon the waiting list.

Many laborers are sent to farms throughout the country, and proprietors of large industries who employ many workmen have filed their exclusive orders with this exchange. They recognize the advantage in having a central official bureau at which

^a These figures are about the size of our tuberculosis statistics of deaths and sufferers in New York City alone. The total reckoning in all overcrowded cities of the United States would far outweigh the numbers sheltered and put to work in Germany.

their requests are promptly filled. Rarely is the right man sent to the wrong place, for workers are collected in sufficient numbers to permit of intelligent discrimination and selection for the various classes of work. Those who seek to take advantage of the exchange are quickly detected and refused privileges of membership.

Department for skilled labor.

Labor unions heartily contribute to the maintenance of the exchange; therefore, union members are not required to pay an initiation fee. This department is subdivided into various trades, with separate rooms for each, where an immense amount of information concerning labor conditions, wages, strikes, etc., is centralized. The managers of the branches are selected by the various unions.

Department for women and girls.

This department is managed by an experienced woman who understands the needs of individual workers. Applicants are arranged in specialized groups, similar to those in the department for unskilled labor, and the manager's desk is in the same room. All sorts of female help is fitted into proper spheres, and careful attention is given to placing unmarried women and girls in good houses as domestics. Proper boarding houses are suggested to those out of work, and in special cases the exchange shelters a few. Business and goodfellowship are combined in this branch and practical advice is given and appreciated.

The need of a similar branch for women and girls in our division of information at New York is shown in the recent report of the Congressional Commission on Immigration as to the harboring of women in the United States for immoral purposes.

The Berlin exchange can cooperate with every city and town in Germany, but similar bureaus in Munich and elsewhere have developed from it.^a

Here is a complete, simple, and work-finding institution which has proved the feasibility of cooperation. It is in sharp contrast with the New York branch of our national distribution bureau, located in three small dismal rooms in the basement of the Maritime Building. The expense for maintenance of this branch of the Division of Information is about \$30 a day, and in fifteen months it distributed 2,099 workers, while the Berlin exchange, at an expense of but \$68 a day, distributed in twelve months 95,678 men and women workers. What is the cause of this difference? Undoubtedly the serious defect in the mode of distribution, heretofore, has been the failure to work upon the problem on the basis of cooperation of all the interests involved.

Cooperation, and but little further expense, is all that is necessary to make the Division of Information the greatest immigrant clearing-house in the world. Its present managers, with the splendid foundation they have laid and their vast knowledge of industrial and agricultural conditions throughout the country, are well qualified to make it a success. They have been handicapped by lack of support.

How far may the National Government count upon the States and Territories to aid in this work, so that distribution may be impartially made on a basis fair to the alien and to his employer? The enforcement by the States of the laws against overcrowding would at once lead to a distribution of the surplus population and of arriving aliens. These could be gathered together in large central bureaus in New York, Chicago, and other cities. Some public-spirited person, or group of persons, might donate suitable buildings in these immigrant centers, and lease the same to the Government at a nominal rent. (The two ample exchange buildings in Berlin were made possible by contribution.) Wise selection for various classes of employment in the States and Territories could be made by the foreign associates from the assembled workers, and foreign colonies could be promoted in rural districts. The further cooperation by the States in providing for assisted transportation, with the representation they would have in the division through their agent-general, would obviate present difficulties in sending the workers on, and lessen the insecurity with respect to repayment of advanced transportation. When workers and settlers reach the States and Territories they could be met by state agents, who could guide them to their proper destinations.

^a The exchange has a lunch room where coffee, with milk and sugar, can be bought for $\frac{1}{2}$ d., a sandwich or slice of sausage for $1\frac{1}{2}$ d., etc., cigars 3 for a penny, and cigarettes 5 a half-penny. Boots can be repaired and clothes mended and cleaned for a half-penny each. There is a medical and hospital room, with first-aid equipment, a free legal bureau, and in the basement a white-tiled bath room, where hot and cold shower baths, in separate rooms, including soap and clean towels, can be had for $\frac{1}{2}$ d. Newspapers and magazines are furnished free by the exchange librarian.

I believe that a cooperative work such as this would be conducive to the welfare of our country. Some of its results would be:

Immigrant masses could be reached to better advantage, therefore their residence could be regulated.

Alien traffic could be turned away from cities to sparsely populated sections and the demand for labor could always be met.

The tuberculosis evil could be eradicated by cleaning out the densely populated cities of the North.

Healthy arriving peasants could be saved from tuberculosis and from other evils of tenements and sweat shops.

Labor could be raised to a standard of respectability and the activities of unprincipled labor agents could be curtailed.

Women and girls could be safeguarded against viciousness, and "white-slave traders" could be driven out.

Criminal and illegal immigration could be detected.

Foreign colonies could be encouraged in rural districts.

Citizenship could be advanced by a readier assimilation with our native born.

[Extract from the report of the Chief of the Division of Information, Department of Commerce and Labor, dated Washington, July 1, 1908. Submitted by Mrs. Quackenbos.]

On July 1, 1907, the Division of Information was established and at once opened up correspondence with the "proper officials of the States and Territories" by writing to each governor and to such other state officials as would be likely to provide information required.

With a view to ascertaining where employment could be obtained by those desiring it, the various associations of manufacturers and individual employers of labor were written to, the idea being to secure information such as would be of benefit to arriving immigrants and others who desired to avail themselves of the services of the division. Through the manufacturers' associations the addresses of individual manufacturers and employers were obtained and to each one a letter of inquiry was addressed as to whether they required workmen. Information was sought as to class of labor, wages paid, hours of employment, and conditions generally. The final question to each employer of labor was as follows: "Do strikes or other labor difficulties exist in your jurisdiction? If so, kindly state cause of same." An effort was also made to obtain the addresses of the various local labor organizations of the country, but without avail, and letters of inquiry were sent to the chief officers of the national and international trades unions. In each letter they were asked to advise as to labor conditions generally and to keep the division informed regarding disturbances in the labor world, the purpose being to place before the alien, or such other person as might desire it, accurate information concerning industrial conditions in an unbiased manner and then leave it to the applicant to elect whether to take advantage of the opportunity presented or not.

Through the courtesy of the Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Agriculture, the township correspondents of that department to the number of 35,000 were corresponded with, and for the purpose of securing detailed and accurate information certain blank forms were submitted in order to give them an accurate idea of the work being done by the division. Each correspondent was requested to let the farmers of his district know of the existence of the division, its object, what information it wished to secure, and to invite them to write to it as to their needs for laborers or workmen.

Inasmuch as the law specified that the information gathered by the division should be available to "such other persons as might desire the same," it was deemed advisable to notify those with whom the division corresponded that citizens as well as aliens would be considered in presenting opportunities for employment.

In order to reach those in need of farm labor and likely to require this class of help in the future the division corresponded with the editors of various periodicals devoted to agriculture, asking that they publish a news item setting forth the efforts to bring to the attention of admitted aliens and unemployed citizens the need for their services in localities where an actual scarcity of labor existed. Samples of the forms in use by the division were transmitted with each letter, asking that the one applicable to farm labor be reproduced for the benefit of the readers of the periodical, with request that they write the division if they required labor, domestics, or had farms to rent on shares.

To the postmaster of every county seat in the United States and its Territories, to the number of 2,839, a letter was forwarded making inquiry as to whether small farms could be leased or purchased in the locality, and details as to price and terms of sale were also sought. In all of these letters full information as to climatic conditions,

kind of crops, number of crops per year, and school, church, and transportation facilities were inquired after, and the person written to was informed that he need not confine himself to answering the questions specified, but might volunteer such other information as he might deem advantageous.

In order to reach the farmers of the United States a system of postal-card inquiry was established, and, through the courtesy and cooperation of the Post-Office Department, cards were intrusted to the rural delivery carriers with instructions that they place a card in each box along the line of their routes. These cards contained a brief statement of the aims and purposes of the division, with directions to detach the return portion, fill it in, and mail to the Division of Information, stating whether they required blanks on which to make applications for farm laborers, common laborers, or mechanics. No mention was made of domestics, as the division soon found it practically impossible to supply the demand for this class of labor, and was obliged to issue a circular letter setting forth the fact that the demand was far in excess of the supply.

This work is now in progress, and over 2,000,000 cards have already gone out. As the answers are received, such blanks as are called for are mailed to the applicant. The purpose of this system of inquiry is to familiarize the division with the actual needs of the agriculturists of the country for labor and to ascertain the conditions of employment.

Correspondence has been had with state boards of agriculture, bureaus of labor and statistics, with boards of trade and chambers of commerce of the various cities, and with factory-inspection departments of various States. This work, which was interfered with by the depression in finances which began to manifest itself in October, 1907, is again under way, and the indications point to much successful work being done by the division in cooperation with these various agencies.

In addition to all of this work, every newspaper item announcing the opening up of a factory or the beginning of work anywhere is made the basis of a letter of inquiry to the concern in question as to its possible need for labor. As will be readily understood, the work involves a great deal of preparation and requires much time, owing to the small force employed in the division.

In order to make a practical use of the information received and to comply with the letter and spirit of the law in promoting a beneficial distribution of admitted aliens and others, the division recommended the establishment of branch offices in New York, Boston, Chicago, and Baltimore, these branches to be under the control and direction of men of experience and ability. The first of the offices to be established was at Ellis Island, but it became apparent that the full work intended by Congress could not be properly presented there, owing to the fact that aliens admitted to the United States and citizens out of employment would not go to Ellis Island for the purpose of securing information.

The alien admitted and out of employment would not go to Ellis Island from the mainland for fear of being deported and American workmen would not apply at Ellis Island through a dread of being classed as aliens. A branch office was therefore established with headquarters at the Maritime Building, New York City. Canon L. Green, an experienced, painstaking, and capable officer, was placed in charge of it. The quarters provided for the branch consisted of one room, but in a short time it became necessary to secure larger quarters, and on May 1, 1908, several rooms in the same building fronting on Pearl street were leased for this branch of the service. The inspector in charge at once placed himself in communication with various benevolent and humanitarian societies which look after and guard the welfare of the various races making up the population of that city, and is now being aided by them in the work of distribution.

All applications received by the Division of Information for laborers or workmen of any kind are at once recorded, classified, made up into bulletin form, and forwarded each day to the branch office at New York, where the inspector in charge places them before all persons who apply to him for information.

As was to be supposed, the establishment of the branch office aroused much opposition among those interested in employment agencies and bureaus, for the Division of Information charges no fees, is open to all, and as its work and scope become better understood must eventually take the place of the other agencies of distribution. Although the actual practical work of distribution did not and could not begin until February, places were found for 840 persons prior to June 30. The States to which they were directed, the character of labor, number, and nationality are given in the tables on next two pages, in which it is deemed advisable to include the distribution to October 31, 1908:

The principal duty of the division during the first year of its existence was to lay the foundation for successful work in the future, to inspire confidence, and to acquire such a knowledge of conditions throughout the country as would be of benefit to the

division in promoting a beneficial distribution of aliens. This work has necessarily been very slow, the idea in view being to avoid errors in administering the law, to secure exact and accurate information, and to direct to places of employment only those fitted for the work ahead of them. One of the gratifying results of the work of the year comes in the shape of letters from those to whom labor has been directed, complimenting the division upon the character and accuracy of its work, and from those directed to opportunities, expressing satisfaction with the treatment received by them from the employers.

Notwithstanding the fact that so many people have been directed to opportunities, few complaints have been made to the division either by employer or employed. An effort has been made to investigate the few complaints that have been recorded, and the information gained warrants the opinion that for the sake of gain, advantage would be taken of the ignorance of the workmen and conditions imposed which were not set forth or foreshadowed in making application for labor. In a few other instances it was discovered that workmen directed to opportunities failed to keep faith with the employer, but this was chiefly through ignorance of our language. On one occasion an alien directed from New York to an inland city, and whose transportation had been advanced by the employer, accepted the opportunity for the purpose of having his fare paid away from New York, and on reaching his destination refused to perform any duty for the person to whom he was directed. In each instance the division took steps to adjust the difficulty so far as it lay in its power, and, happily, was successful. The experience gained, however, was of value in that it suggested a remedy for the evils complained of and will serve as a guide for the future.

The law directs that information gathered by the division be given "to all who may ask for it at the immigrant stations and to such others as may desire the same." Under a liberal construction of the law, it has been deemed advisable to allow citizens out of employment an opportunity to avail themselves of the advantages presented by the division in providing information as to where employment could be obtained. Owing to the closing of factories and workshops following the depression of last year, the principal work of the division was to direct applicants to the farming districts.

Up to the present time the laboring population of Europe have been in ignorance of the resources of the United States; to-day the principal information on which foreign workmen emigrate to the United States comes from the large cities and mining and manufacturing centers of the Union. The popular impression among the workmen of Europe is that the United States is one of four things, a city street, the bed of a railroad, a factory, or a coal mine. That there are fertile acres in the United States on which men may settle and thrive is not generally known among the workmen of Europe, and as those previously admitted have contented themselves with working upon the streets, along railroads, in factories, or in mines their correspondence with friends at home in the old country naturally induces others to come to these places. Under the direction and work of the division this condition of affairs must ultimately change, for every man directed to a congenial place on a farm, every man who becomes the possessor of a farm, every tenant, and every one who shares the profits of a farm will become a missionary, and in correspondence with friends in Europe will inform them that our resources do not consist solely of opportunities heretofore named, and in time the tide of immigration must turn away from the congested centers to the land.

Under a strict construction of the law as now worded publications printed by the division shall be distributed "among all admitted aliens who may ask for such information at the immigrant stations of the United States and to such other persons as may desire the same." Experience has demonstrated that the placing of a publication of any kind before a newly admitted alien at an immigrant station is valueless, for the newcomer is always excited, anxious, and in haste to proceed on his journey. He knows nothing of the contents of the document presented to him, has no time nor inclination to read it, and, if it is at all bulky, will not even accept it. In order to inform arriving aliens of the existence and purpose of the division, it would be well to place such matter as may be published before them while on shipboard after leaving the port of embarkation. Correspondence was had with various steamship and transportation lines to ascertain if they would cooperate with the division in this work, and favorable replies were received.

Under the law as framed and constituted no information can be published abroad, but every thinking person must realize that information as to conditions in the United States does find its way to the homes of the people in Europe, much of this information is unreliable, some of it distorted, and during a voyage of ten days or two weeks the immigrants who are coming to our shores could at their leisure read or have read to them the information presented to them by the division, and they could study and digest it prior to landing. Being a government agency, bearing the seal and approval of the Government of the United States, facts presented would be accepted

as reliable, the immigrant would have confidence in them, and on arrival in this country would apply to the various branches of the division for details as to opportunities for employment or land to rent or purchase, etc.

It should be the duty of the Division of Information to be able at a moment's notice to give information to those requiring it, whether alien or citizen, concerning every opportunity for employment and the conditions of same in every part of the United States, whether in shop, mill, mine, factory, on railroad, or under municipal, county, or state control, or with public or private corporation.

The inquiries submitted to agriculturists call for information relating to available acreage, whether for sale, rent, or to be let on shares, proximity to city or town, means of transportation, and fertility of land; kind, quality, and frequency of crops; denomination and number of churches in neighborhood; number and grades of schools and length of school year; facilities for banking, and nationalities in neighborhood; and as the work develops and questions are suggested by the returns made to the division other lines of inquiry will be pursued until every known source will be followed and every useful item of information obtained.

To gather information as directed by statute and give it to such arriving aliens as might ask for it would not be productive of much good and would not be in harmony with the spirit of the law or the intent of its makers. When times are normal there are men out of work in some places and employment awaiting men at other points. To ascertain the number, location, character, and every other essential thing concerning these vacancies, to learn what manner of men will qualify to fill them, and to bring man and work together with the least waste of time and money and to the satisfaction of employer and employed, would seem to be as much the duty of the Division of Information as the gathering and handing out information to aliens who might ask for it or to others who might desire the same.

To more effectually deal with the question of imparting up-to-date information to admitted aliens and to warn them against the pitfalls ahead, it would be well to assemble them, after admission, and prior to departure, in a room or hall connected with the immigrant station and there explain to them in familiar language what to do and how to proceed after landing. The bulletins of the Division of Information could be read and explained and, in case of detention for any length of time, lectures on various topics of value to them could be delivered. With this idea in view the division, early in the year, instituted inquiry as to the practicability of making use of lantern slide exhibitions and the phonograph in this work, and without argument in favor of its benefits it is strongly urged that the matter be favorably considered. If it is, the full details may be arranged later.

The Division of Information was fortunate in having the cooperation of a number of patriotic and philanthropic organizations, chief among them being the Sons of the American Revolution. This society prepared and placed at the disposal of the division a publication entitled "Information for Immigrants." It deals with questions relating to our form of government, and has been translated into Polish, Slovenian, Yiddish, Croatian, Swedish, Lithuanian, Magyar, Slovak, Greek, Bohemian, Italian, German, and Danish, and is being circulated among admitted aliens and others.

There exists no reason why the Division of Information may not become the avenue through which the congestion in large centers of population shall pass outward to places where remunerative employment may be had, through which the stream of immigration may intelligently and profitably flow and from which may come the answer to the question, What shall we do to properly direct the stream of immigration and keep citizen and alien profitably employed?

Respectfully,

T. V. POWDERLY,
Chief Division of Information.

Hon. F. P. SARGENT,
Commissioner-General of Immigration.

EXTRACT FROM REPORT OF THE CHIEF OF THE DIVISION OF INFORMATION, DATED WASHINGTON, JULY 1, 1909.

[Submitted by Mrs. Quackenbos.]

In no instance was a strike, lockout, or other labor disturbance in progress or contemplated at a time when any of those directed by the division went forward. It is apparent also that great care was exercised in the selection of those who applied for information and were directed to opportunities, for very few complaints have been

filed with the division, and these have been more than offset by commendatory letters where employers have been satisfied and thanked the division for its work in directing the labor where it was needed.

The records of the division show that but 20 of those directed to employment failed to reach proper destination. Of this number the cost of transportation was advanced by the employer in 11 cases. Five of the 20 paid their own transportation expenses, and the cost of transportation in the other 4 cases was advanced by various charitable organizations. Of the 11 cases in which the employer advanced the cost of transportation, disappointment was avoided in 7 of them by directing other men, who paid their own transportation.

In 2 of the 11 cases the employers reported that the men arrived, but in one instance that he left the railroad station next day without proceeding to the employer's farm or notifying him of his arrival; in the other the employee undoubtedly arrived at or near the proper destination and went to work for another employer in that vicinity.

Of the aforementioned 20 who went astray en route, 11 were destined to points west of Chicago, which necessitated a transfer from one railroad station to another at that point. This emphasizes the importance of adopting some system of regulating the passage through that city of aliens destined to points beyond.

The fact that 2,202 of those applying for information located in New York State and 676 in New Jersey does not indicate that the inducements offered in those States were greater than those of other States. The lack of means to defray expenses of transportation was, no doubt, a prime factor in determining many applicants to avail themselves of opportunities at points within those States to which the cost of transportation was not beyond their means.

It must be borne in mind that the work of the Division of Information is yet in its initial stage; that its purpose and scope are just beginning to be understood. All of its work has been done in the face of adverse conditions. Actual distribution did not begin until nine months after the division began to collect information, and then in the midst of a financial and industrial depression the evil effects of which are but now being hidden by the smoke from furnaces, factories, and workshops that are again renewing the activities so suddenly paralyzed in October, 1907.

Thousands of able, healthy, willing workers have anxiously scanned the records of opportunities presented to them by the Division of Information, only to turn away disappointed, for the most alluring of them lay at points hopelessly beyond their grasp because of financial inability to reach destination. Even when the panic was at its height, the Division of Information could have directed thousands of people to places where they could secure employment on the land, were it not for the lack of means on the part of applicants to defray traveling expenses.

Forty-five nationalities contributed to the number of those benefited by the work of the division. Many of those applying for help express a preference for certain nationalities or races. The division has therefore included in the list of questions submitted to prospective employers one which gives them the opportunity to state whether they have a choice in the matter.

Among aliens, those coming from northern Europe are preferred by perhaps a majority of applicants for farm labor. As the value of the southern European as a fruit grower becomes known, the demand for his services grows in volume.

A total of 26,477 applicants for information were served at the branch offices of the division during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1909. Care was exercised in noting these applicants so as to avoid duplication. While the same person may have made inquiry on several different occasions, he was listed but once. The figures given do not and can not show the full number benefited by receipt of information, for many applicants represented groups ranging from 5 to 50. The division has no means of ascertaining how many acted on the information received.

When an applicant makes his selection and is specifically directed to an opportunity, he is provided with a note of introduction to the prospective employer. This serves to identify him, and the employer is requested to notify the division of his arrival. In cases where applicants call at the branch offices of the division, look over the opportunities presented, make notes of the same, and take the addresses of prospective employers, it is impossible for the division to ascertain how many of these are employed, since the employers are not requested to notify the division of their arrival, and unless conditions are not favorable to either party no information will reach the division concerning the matter.

CHARGE OF FURNISHING STRIKE BREAKERS.

A report gained circulation during the year that the Division of Information was furnishing strike breakers to cigar-manufacturing firms in Pennsylvania. The facts, briefly stated, are as follows: On October 23, 1908, Emanuel Cadilak, of 371 East

Seventy-second street, New York, called at the New York branch of the division, No. 17 Pearl street, and made the statement that 400 cigar workers were wanted by the Harrisburg Cigar Company, at Harrisburg, Pa. He stated labor conditions were good, that no strikes or labor troubles were in progress, and that the union scale of wages would be paid. On October 24, when the matter was referred to the division, a letter was sent to the secretary of the American Federation of Labor inquiring whether there was "a strike or lockout in progress or in contemplation, also the union scale of wages for Harrisburg." The letter was answered on the same day by the president of the American Federation of Labor, who, among other things, said he could not "definitely answer either question you propound, but I can state that there are now in the United States fully 25 per cent of the cigar makers of the country unemployed." On receipt of this communication, on October 24, the secretary of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 244, of Harrisburg, was written to with request that he "inform the division as to the regular union scale of wages which prevails in the cigar-making industry in your district. We would like this in detail, showing wages paid to female as well as male help; also inform us if there is a scarcity of labor existing in the Harrisburg cigar factories at this time." That letter was dated October 24, 1908; an early reply was requested. An answer was received on November 13, 1908, in which the secretary said, "Positively no demand for cigar makers, union or nonunion. * * * Union wages start at \$7 per 1,000 to \$13 per 1,000." The question referring to strikes or lockouts was not answered.

Through unofficial channels it was learned that no strike was then in progress and that no strike had taken place in recent years in the cigar trade in Harrisburg or vicinity.

On November 5, 1908, Mr. Cadilak again called at 17 Pearl street, and as agent of the Columbia Cigar Company, of Columbia, Pa., made application for 100 girls to go to Columbia to engage in cigar working. He made the same statement concerning labor conditions as in the case of the Harrisburg Cigar Company. It appears that Mr. Cadilak about this time inserted an advertisement in certain New York papers, published in foreign languages, advising those desirous of going to Harrisburg and Columbia to apply at No. 17 Pearl street (the New York branch of the division) for particulars. This was unauthorized by anyone connected with the division, and information concerning it was not received until workmen applied for details as to terms of employment in response to said advertisements. Those who called were given such information as could be gathered. A number, perhaps 30, went to Columbia. When reports were received to the effect that they were not being treated properly, the inspector in charge of information work at 17 Pearl street wired the division, on November 20, 1908, as follows: "Advisable to investigate Columbia and Harrisburg cigar factories." Immigrant Inspector John J. Grgurevich, attached to the Baltimore immigrant station, was detailed by the bureau to investigate conditions in the cigar factories, not only in Harrisburg and Columbia, but in adjoining territory as well. Instructions were issued to branch offices of the division not to direct any persons to either Harrisburg or Columbia until after a thorough investigation had been made, but notwithstanding this fact a number of those applying at the New York branch of the division, and who were advised not to go, went to both places.

Mr. Grgurevich made a thorough and painstaking investigation and submitted a full and comprehensive report of his findings. From this report, which is too lengthy to include with this, it was learned that the New York agent of the cigar-manufacturing firms in question had either misrepresented conditions of employment or else failed to impart full information to those whose services he had engaged. Aside from the questions of wages or hours of employment, the Division of Information regarded it as inadvisable to direct the attention of seekers for information to the cigar factories involved.

It was clearly proved that no strike or lockout was in progress or in contemplation or that either had occurred in recent years in that particular part of Pennsylvania.

The report, therefore, that the Division of Information was furnishing strike breakers, or was being used for that purpose, even remotely, was without foundation.

NECESSITY FOR OTHER BRANCHES.

An effort was made during the year to establish a branch of the division in Chicago, Ill. It was the intention to secure quarters which would be adequate to the needs of the Immigration Service in Chicago and at the same time provide space for the inspector in charge of information work, who was to be assisted in his duties by the entire immigration force in Chicago. The necessary room could not be found, and in order to initiate the work of distribution in Chicago one of the immigrant inspectors was detailed to act as inspector in charge of information work. He was instructed to

investigate and report on a number of offices. One of the places reported on by this officer was approved of and a lease entered into for the balance of the fiscal year. It was deemed inadvisable to renew the lease and as a consequence the branch office in Chicago was not continued.

The Division of Information is of opinion that a branch of the division should be established in Chicago, Ill., and another in St. Louis, Mo. Applications by the thousand are on file from the Western and Southwestern States to which no one can be directed because of lack of funds on the part of those seeking information and the great distance from the Atlantic seaboard.

Chicago and St. Louis have thousands of able, willing men out of employment before whom the division could lay its best opportunities, but there is no way of reaching them or of imparting this information to them.

If during the coming year arrangements can be made to secure office room for the Immigration Service in these two cities commodious enough to give space to a branch of the Division of Information, it will enable this branch of the service to "promote a beneficial distribution of aliens" and others who may be in need of information concerning opportunities to engage in labor on farms, to settle on land, or to engage in profit sharing on the land.

ADAPTABILITY OF SETTLERS.

The effort to divert the tide of immigration to agricultural sections of the country is of doubtful value unless conditions are favorable. Soil and climate should be suitable, the latter approximating to that of the home of the immigrant, the former not only fertile but adapted to crops like those the immigrant, if a farmer, was accustomed to raising at home. Many other things enter into the question of a "beneficial distribution" of aliens and others. The person directed by the division must be protected from the greed of those who would possibly take advantage of his ignorance. So far as possible, those who do not speak English should be directed to localities where others of their race have settled, for the most heartbreaking experience that can come to a man is to find himself anchored in a place where he can not converse in his mother tongue—or any other—with his neighbors. More aliens have, perhaps, remained in large cities or congested centers or have drifted back to them through this cause than any other.

CONCLUSION.

In conclusion attention is called to the fact that in an endeavor to promote a beneficial distribution of admitted aliens the utmost conservatism has been exercised as regards conduct of the division and its branch offices, selection of men for direction to opportunities, and financial expenditures. Such results as have accrued in the way of distribution are traceable to a genuine demand for laborers in the agricultural sections. Employers were not only ready to cooperate with the division to the extent of submitting applications, but were willing in many instances to advance transportation. The division is satisfied that, apart from ignorance of our language on the part of a large number of immigrants and the want of transportation money, the principal drawback is the lack of understanding on the part of newcomers regarding our agricultural resources, methods of farming, and advantages to be derived away from the crowded cities. Inducements to settlers on the land constitute a line of inquiry as yet hardly touched upon. It would be instrumental in distribution, but progress in this direction has been retarded in the interest of economy. Propositions of this nature require investigation prior to the direction of anyone, and investigations can not be conducted by correspondence.

The argument that the division induces immigration is without foundation in fact, and no evidence has been produced to support it. Immigration will continue as long as the law permits; those who are here bring others in times of prosperity, and the only question is whether they shall be allowed to settle, as heretofore, in the crowded centers or be directed to opportunities elsewhere. It was with a full realization of the need for distribution that Congress created the Division of Information, and its importance, now that prosperity will swell the tide of immigration, is augmented. Success in large measure can only come by slow growth and experience gained through persistent effort. All things considered, the division has, so far, performed its work well. The good it has done outweighs the criticisms, many of them made in ignorance of facts, and the benefits conferred on employer and employee entitle it to consideration and support.

Respectfully,

T. V. POWDERLY,
Chief, Division of Information.

To Hon. DANL. J. KEEFE,
Commissioner-General of Immigration.

BLANK FORMS USED BY THE DIVISION OF INFORMATION.

[Submitted by Mrs. Quackenbos.]

[Information blank. Form C.]

No. ———

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,

(Settlers.)

BUREAU OF IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,

DIVISION OF INFORMATION,

WASHINGTON.

The following questions relative to lands for sale or rent must be answered before your proposition can be intelligently presented to prospective purchasers or renters:

1. Name and complete address of owner or agent authorized to enter into contract with prospective purchaser or renter: ———, ———, ———.

2. Two references: ———, ———.

3. Are lands for sale or rent? ———.

4. Price, sale or rental, conditions in full (in cases where farms are worked on shares or for sale on long-time contracts a copy of the lease or contract should be forwarded with this blank): ———.

5. Number of one-man farms (that is, of an area that can be cultivated by one man): ———.

6. Size of such one-man farms: ———.

7. Is land under cultivation? ———.

8. If rented on shares, how divided? Does owner provide stock, implements, or seeds? ———.

9. Kinds of crops: ———.

10. Character of soil: ———.

11. Location of lands: ———.

12. Is irrigation necessary; and if so, under what conditions is water supplied? ———.

13. What are the rail, water, or wagon-road facilities for transportation? ———.

14. Nationalities preferred: ———.

15. What are the inducements to settlers? ———.

Remarks: ———.

(Date.) ———.

(Sign here.) ———.

Information blank. Form D.

(DOMESTICS.)

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
BUREAU OF IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,
DIVISION OF INFORMATION.
WASHINGTON.

No. _____.

The applicant for domestic help should give careful specific replies to the following questions:

1. Employer: _____, _____, _____, _____, _____.
2. References: _____, _____.
3. Number of domestics desired: _____.
4. Nature of duties: _____.
5. Nationalities preferred: _____.
6. Would either single or married women be acceptable? _____.
7. Would children be objectionable? _____.
8. Could employment be found for husbands? _____.
9. Wages you intend paying domestics: _____.
10. Will a home be provided? _____.
11. (a) Will transportation be paid from point within United States? _____.
(b) Will amount be deducted later from employee's wages? _____.
12. Will employment be permanent? _____.
13. Hours required: _____.
14. Advantages offered to employees: _____.

Remarks: _____.

(Date.) _____.

(Sign here.) _____

[NOTE.—Additional sheets may be used if necessary.]

Information blank. Form E.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
BUREAU OF IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,
DIVISION OF INFORMATION,
WASHINGTON.

No. _____.

Please give answers in detail to the following questions relative to churches, schools, etc., in your immediate neighborhood:

1. State in or near what city, town, or village you are located; also give county and State: _____, _____, _____.
2. Denomination of churches in the neighborhood. (Churches at which foreign language is spoken should be indicated by the language spoken as well as by the denomination; for example, "German Lutheran," "Polish Catholic," etc.)
1. _____. 2. _____. 3. _____. 4. _____. 5. _____. 6. _____. 7. _____.
8. _____.
3. What are the school facilities and to what grades do the schools extend? _____.
4. Is there a high school near by? _____.
5. What is the length of the school year? _____.
6. What are the predominating foreign nationalities in your vicinity? - _____.
7. Are there persons near by who speak the language of the alien help you have applied for? _____.
8. What is the prevailing climate in your vicinity? _____.

Information blank.
Form B.

[For use in making application for farm help.]

(FARM LABORERS.)

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
BUREAU OF IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,
DIVISION OF INFORMATION,
WASHINGTON.

No. ———.

[See notations on back hereof before attempting to fill out this blank. Write name and address plainly.]

1. Employer: ———, ———, ———, ———, ———.
2. References: ———.
3. Number of men you wish to hire: ———.
4. Nature of duties: ———.
5. (a) Nationalities acceptable (state whether or not knowledge of English is necessary): ———.
- (b) Will English-speaking men of any other nationality be acceptable? ———.
- (c) Do you desire experienced help or "green hands?" ———.
6. (a) Married or single men preferred: ———.
- (b) Do you require that married men be accompanied by wives? ———.
- (c) Will children be objectionable? ———.
7. (a) Will transportation be paid from points within the United States? ———.
- (b) If so, will amount be deducted later from employee's wages? ———.
- (c) Will you refund the money so deducted after a period of service; and if so, under what conditions? ———.
8. (a) What money wage will you pay to married man {green hand? \$———
experienced hand? \$———} per month and will house (furnished or unfurnished), garden patch, milk, etc., be provided free in addition to wages? ———.
- (b) Would services of wife be required; and if so, her duties and compensation therefor? ———.
- (c) What wages will you pay single man {green hand? \$———
experienced hand? \$———} per month.
- and will board, lodging, washing, etc., be furnished free in addition to wages? ———.
- (d) Are summer wages same as winter wages? ———. If not, give each: Winter, \$——— per month; summer, \$——— per month.
9. When will services of this help be required? ———.
10. Hours of labor: ———.
11. Will employment be permanent? ———.
12. Special advantages and remarks: ———.
- (Date) ———.

READ CAREFULLY BEFORE FILLING OUT BLANK.

In addition to answering carefully all the questions on this blank, your especial attention is called to the following:

QUESTION 4. *Nature of duties.*—Define whether a "farmer" or a "farm laborer" is wanted. A "farmer" will be understood to mean one who is competent to take charge of and operate a farm without supervision. A "farm laborer" will be understood to mean one who has had some experience, but is to work under the immediate direction and supervision of the employer. If a "green hand" will be accepted as a farm laborer, it should be so stated. Also make it clear whether you operate a "dairy farm," "stock farm," "truck farm," etc.

QUESTION 5. *Nationalities preferred.*—As much scope as possible should be allowed in the matter of nationalities which would be acceptable to you.

QUESTION 6. *Married or single men preferred.*—If your preference be for a man and wife, state whether or not a single man will answer, provided we are unable to supply the married couples. This is asked because at times there is a scarcity of the latter.

QUESTION 7. *Will transportation be paid from point within United States?*—The necessity for this question is due to the fact that many good men apply at our branch offices who would willingly go to distant points, but are unable to do so without aid from the prospective employer. Such advance would, of course, be made through a

representative of this division, who would see that the employee was properly ticketed and then mail his baggage check direct to the employer interested, which would serve somewhat as a precaution against an employee going astray.

It must be distinctly understood, however, that the responsibility of the division and its representative ends when the said employee has been placed upon the train or boat. No guaranty is given or implied that he will actually arrive at his destination.

QUESTION 8. *Wages*.—This question must not be left unanswered, because of the fact that an employee wants to have some idea as to the wages he is to receive before accepting an offer, and this point should be definitely stated. If wages are stated at so much per day, it should be made clear whether employee is paid *every* day in the month or only for such days as work can be performed. Also approximate pay received per week or month in such case.

All communications relative hereto should be addressed as follows: Division of Information, Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, Department of Commerce and Labor, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Monday, March 14, 1910.

The committee met at 11 o'clock a. m., Hon. Benjamin F. Howell (chairman) presiding. Others present were Representatives Hayes, Burnett, Sabath, Moore, of Pennsylvania, and O'Connell.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ADOLPH J. SABATH, REPRESENTATIVE FROM CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, as we are about to take a vote on the provisions to increase the head tax and to provide for an educational test, I desire to discuss briefly these questions and some of the other important provisions contained in the Hayes, Elvins, and Gardner bills, which we have before us.

Section 1 of the Hayes bill provides for an increase of the head tax on every immigrant from \$4 to \$10, and in the Elvins bill to \$25. Why we should increase the tax I do not know, unless it be to further restrict immigration and place more difficult, yes, in a majority of cases impossible, obstructions in the way of poor immigrants. We have no deficit in our immigrant fund, and the revenue derived from the present tax more than suffices to meet all our expenditures in the Immigration Service.

Section 2 prescribes an educational test, again aiming to restrict and prevent thousands upon thousands of honest and hard-working people, the majority of whom come from rural or farming districts. The educational test proposed in these bills would not affect those immigrants who come from the larger centers, for they, as a rule, are literate. You will find that the people who come from the countries from which we receive the majority of illiterates, the percentage of these which are unfortunate enough to be sent to our penal institutions for committing some crimes or offenses, is smaller than from the countries from which we receive the majority of literate immigrants. In other words, the percentage of criminals is greater among literate people than among the illiterate ones. And I firmly believe that those who have been deprived of the opportunity of an education in their own countries, through no fault of their own, will and do perform manual labor as intelligently and as conscientiously on farms, in shops, factories, and mines as those who were more fortunate in having the

advantages of education. Besides, those who do possess an education are apt to and do shy from performing the work which the illiterate immigrant performs.

This section also contains a provision making it obligatory upon all male aliens over 16 years of age, and all unmarried or widowed females over 18 years of age, to possess in their own right at least \$25 in lawful money of the United States or its equivalent in other moneys. In the Elvins bill the minimum amount which such aliens must possess is fixed at the preposterous sum of \$100. This requirement is utterly unreasonable, and in many respects it is cruel. If enacted, it would practically build an almost insurmountable barrier, which would prevent the vast majority of immigrants from entering this country. This requirement is not founded upon any law, inasmuch as it seeks to establish property qualifications, which is a proposition inherently odious to free people.

Another feature which is embodied in this section of the Hayes bill, and which is also found in the Elvins bill, is that which excludes all aliens who do not bring a certificate of good moral character, signed by and under the seal of the proper official whose duty it is to keep such record in the community from which they come. It would be impossible to obtain such a certificate, because the authorities, for reasons of a political, or religious, or of a military nature, even then, as they do now, refuse to issue such certificates to persons who would come under their ban. The curse of militarism which pervades Europe is the reason for many honest and sincere immigrants leaving their native countries; and the oppressed and persecuted people would be completely at the mercy of their persecutors, who, in the main, are governmental officials. From an impartial standpoint, it is impossible to construe all of these requirements which appear in section 2 of the Hayes bill and which are also embodied in the Elvins bill in any other way than a palpable intent to put an end to immigration.

Section 4 of the Hayes bill, which provides for the deportation of criminal aliens, and which is also found in the Elvins bill, does not require any attention, because we have already passed a separate bill upon this matter. In passing, however, I will say that the language employed in both the Hayes and Elvins bills upon the subject of deportation of criminal aliens makes this section unconstitutional.

Section 5 of the Hayes bill seeks to repeal that portion of the immigration act which authorizes the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to accept bonds in certain cases where aliens are detained at at the various ports of the United States against whom deportation orders have been entered. Under this section aliens would be deported even more summarily than now.

Section 6 provides for the exclusion of all girls under 20 years of age, unaccompanied by one or both of their parents, subject, however, to the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, and under such rules and regulations as he may from time to time prescribe. There is no necessity for any provision of this kind, as we have passed a most stringent "white slave" bill, which will, if properly enforced, reach every attempt at this nefarious traffic. This section can only be construed as giving the Secretary of Commerce and Labor greater restrictive power, and the more power you give

an individual, the more he is likely to abuse it. Besides there are thousands of honest and virtuous girls who would be prevented from coming to this country, who seek situations as domestic servants. As it is, there is quite a scarcity of good servants, and we need all that we can get.

Section 7 contains the most ridiculous and absurd provision which has ever been injected into a bill. This farcial provision also found in the Elvins bill, provides that every unnaturalized alien shall within one year after either of these bills becomes a law, obtain a certificate of residence which shall contain his full description as will readily identify him, which certificate shall contain a photographic likeness, both full face and profile, bearing the seal of the Department of Commerce and Labor; and the failure of such unnaturalized alien to obtain this certificate of residence within one year will be sufficient ground for his deportation. Under this provision it matters not how long he may have lived here, if he failed to comply with this ridiculous provision, and subject himself to the ignominy of what practically amounts to a Bertillon test for criminals, he would be apprehended on a warrant of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor and deported. The consequent injury and damage to such a person and his family is not given the slightest attention or consideration in this provision, and the prejudice toward immigrants as exemplified in this section is most palpable and admits of no dispute.

Section 10 of the Hayes bill contains a provision that all unnaturalized aliens who seek permission to enter the United States upon the ground of being members of the learned professions, or teachers, merchants, bankers, editors, or students, or travelers for curiosity or pleasure, shall produce a certificate showing the permission of the government of which they are subjects or domiciled residents to travel or pursue their avocations in this country, and this certificate must be visaéd by our diplomatic or consular officials at the port or place from which such aliens are about to depart. It is also required that a photographic likeness of such person is attached to an affidavit which must set forth a great deal of irrelevant data, which, of course, must be investigated and passed upon by our officials. If this provision were to pass, we would be the objects of ridicule the world over, and, aside from being made a "laughingstock," many serious complications with respect to our treaties would arise, which would result in an interminable confusion and subject American travelers to the same humiliation in foreign countries as is attempted in this section. There is no question but that the foreign powers would retaliate in kind.

In the same section of the Elvins bill there is a provision which requires that such persons shall be excluded from admission into this country who are between the ages of 16 and 50 years who can not pass the physical examination prescribed for recruits by the military regulations of the United States Army. The utter absurdity of this provision is too apparent, but I call your attention to it simply for the purpose of showing you to what extremes the foes of immigration will go.

I have summed up some of the most important features contained in both the Hayes and the Elvins bills. These bills are utterly unfair and unjust to the poor though honest immigrant who seeks to better his condition in life, and who endeavors to escape from

persecutions and oppressions. I believe that these bills are the most drastic that have ever been introduced in Congress since its inception, and they reek with prejudice and bias toward the immigrant. The provisions contained in these bills are so despotic in their nature that they ought not have even a place in the legislative archives of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, from time to time we have certain people urging restriction against immigration. And the question arises, who demands it? Why should our Government adopt still greater restrictive measures against immigration? There are some who honestly believe that the large immigration is detrimental to our labor conditions, but the majority of those who raise the hue and cry against immigration are least informed upon this great question, and as a rule come from those sections of the country to which immigrants do not come, and in consequence their arguments are pregnant with prejudice and ignorance. No one who has carefully studied the conditions of our country can successfully deny that the tremendous progress and development of the country is largely due to the foreign-born people and their descendants. In fact, this proposition does not admit of dispute. But even if they had not contributed so much to the country's welfare as they had, shall we not extend welcome to humanity which seeks freedom and emancipation from governmental oppression and despotism?

Our Government guarantees under and by virtue of the Constitution liberty, and liberty is the goal which the alien strives to reach. Once reached it serves as an incentive for improvement, and within a short time he becomes Americanized and is ideal material for American citizenship. It take but a short time that he becomes one of us, and no one can question his patriotism, honesty, industry, and progress. If you have any doubt as to his patriotism look over the list of our enlisted men in the army and navy service, or the rolls upon which appear the names of the heroic volunteers who battled in our wars and your doubt will surely be dispelled.

It is absolutely essential in order to maintain the great progress of this country that we should not further restrict immigration. The industry of the country requires and demands the labor of the foreigner, and it is erroneous to presume that the immigrant is a competitor with our American labor. On the contrary, the employment of immigrant labor creates a demand for better American labor, for a better grade of labor, and it is productive of better wages for our workingmen. The work performed by the immigrant is that of the hardest kind, work of a character for which it is well nigh impossible to obtain American labor, yet, which nevertheless must be performed and without the aid of which American labor would suffer. It is variously estimated that over 550,000 workingmen are either killed or injured each year in the course of their work, and the grim law of necessity requires that these unfortunate men who are claimed by our commerce and industry must be replaced. What would be our position were we not favored with immigrant labor? It is this class of labor which makes it possible for our manufacturers to compete with the world, thereby creating new fields and new markets for our goods and products, and, as I have stated before, creates new demands for a higher and better grade of labor, with increased wages. This is best illustrated by the report of the Department of Commerce and

Labor, which shows that for the fiscal year 1910 our manufacturers' exports will reach the enormous sum of \$750,000,000, against \$453,000,000 in 1902, \$258,000,000 in 1896, and \$179,000,000 in 1890, an increase in twenty years of \$576,000,000, or 445 per cent. So as to make it clear to everyone, the average daily exports did not amount to \$600,000 per day in 1890, but to-day the daily exports from this country will exceed the huge sum of \$2,500,000 a day for the fiscal year of 1910. Now, let me ask of the most rabid restrictionist whether we could do this, or if it would be possible to expand our export trade as I have shown, if we did not have the labor? Where scarcity of common labor exists there is a material deterioration in commerce and industry, and for a practical illustration of this proposition I refer you to the conditions prevailing in Germany, which country finds itself greatly embarrassed by the scarcity of common labor, making it impossible for its merchants and manufacturers to fill orders for their manufactures and products. And there are other places which face the same predicament, and even in this country there are many localities clamoring for labor, for shops, factories, mills, mines, and also for the farms. And to prove my contention I shall read one of the many resolutions which I have received:

THE STATE SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURE,
Morrisville, N. Y., March 12, 1910.

The following resolutions were adopted at a recent meeting of the board of trustees of the State School of Agriculture, at Morrisville:

"Resolved, That it is the opinion of the board of trustees of the State School of Agriculture, at Morrisville, N. Y., that one of the crying needs of the farmers of the State of New York and of the country at large is an adequate supply of intelligent farm labor; and this board gives its hearty approval to any action which can or may be taken by the National Congress or the legislature of the State of New York to supply such labor through the enlargement of the present national Bureau of Distribution and the creation by New York State of the proposed bureau recommended by the state commission, which in 1908-9 investigated labor conditions in New York.

"Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this board and copies thereof forwarded to the proper authorities at Albany and Washington.

"Resolved, That the secretary of this board be directed to carry on the purpose of these resolutions."

Yours, truly,

JOHN H. BROAD, *Secretary.*

That immigration has been and is now of great benefit no one can successfully deny. But you gentlemen, the same as others who are but slightly acquainted with the progress and development of our country, must recognize and admit that immigration has brought about our great wealth and prosperity. Look back a few short years before immigration commenced and see how millions and millions of acres of land in the Middle West, Northwest, and West were dormant and unproductive, which could have been easily purchased for one, two, or three dollars per acre, and to-day the same lands, due to immigration, have increased from ten to one hundred times in value. The thousands and thousands of honest, thrifty, and industrious immigrants, who settled amid untold hardships upon the prairies and swamps of this country, have converted these lands, heretofore useless and practically of no value, into veritable gardens, rich and productive farms, and large and enterprising towns and cities. Last week we had before us a gentleman representing the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, urging an illiteracy test, increase of the head-tax, a money test, and "other effective restrictive measures."

I am frank to say that I have never before heard about this so-called Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, whose officials and representatives state without a tremor of self-reproach that the membership is anywhere from 2,000,000 to 3,000,000 farmers living in all parts of the country. According to these representatives this vast membership is opposed to the present immigration laws, and they demand more "effective restrictive measures." Really, I should like to know just what the actual membership is, and where they come from. Their object and purpose, according to the statements coming from some of these officials, is selfish, and their contention that "less farm products, the higher the prices received therefor," deserves not the slightest consideration, and I condemn it as utterly unprincipled. Last month we had before us a gentleman representing the Junior Order United American Mechanics, of the State of New York, who stated that this order is opposed to the present immigration law, and desires the Congress to enact more stringent legislation. This order, I am reliably informed, is the same as the old bigoted A. P. A. party, merely operating under a new name.

My patriotism would not permit me to stand here and advocate the cause of immigration were I not convinced and satisfied in my belief that immigrant labor is not detrimental to our workingmen. It goes without saying that the American Federation of Labor has accomplished a great deal of good for the cause of labor, and humanity; it has aided in securing a material betterment of the working conditions, and it has helped to bring about a higher standard of wages for the workingmen. I am thoroughly in sympathy with its purposes, and I agree with its great leaders upon nearly all propositions except their contention on this question of immigration. I can not see any justice in their opposition to immigration, and I am confident that they will soon come to realize that it is but a matter of fairness to the thousands of oppressed, persecuted, and starving men, women and children who seek to make this country their future home, that they will withdraw their opposition and extend a hearty welcome to immigrants. This, I am positive can not and will not in any way affect our own conditions, but it will bring good cheer and happiness to thousands of unfortunate fellow-beings who would be prevented to enter this country if the bills which we have before us should be enacted into law. Besides, there is a question even in the minds of those who most earnestly demand this legislation with respect to its effect upon our labor conditions, why then ought not the benefit of the doubt be given to those unfortunate people who will be ever thankful and properly appreciate our hospitality.

Mr. Chairman, the problem of immigration is one which settles itself. I believe that it is entirely unnecessary to legislate any further in this matter, for the present laws are strict enough in every respect. Instead, we should pass H. R. 18399, introduced by me last January, which provides for the improvement and betterment of the miserable and deplorable conditions existing in the steerages of vessels which carry the immigrants to our shores. By passing my bill you will in a great measure estop the steamship companies from pursuing their campaign of unlawful advertising, which in a great measure enlarges their business and profits and stimulates and increases immigration out of all proportions. As my bill provides for many improvements and changes actually necessary in the

steerage, thus bringing about more humane treatment, to which these poor people are manifestly entitled, and, besides, it will make it less profitable for the "steamship trust." And for the latter reason the "steamship trust" will be less prone to spend huge sums of money for its unlawful advertisements. And another reason why we should pass my bill is that it provides for heavy punishment for any and all unlawful and untruthful advertising on the part of any steamship company or its agents. So by the passage of my bill we will protect and take ample care of all immigrants who are desirous of coming to this country, and who do so voluntarily and of their own free will and desire, whose purpose is to remain with us and make this country their permanent domicile. We will thereby put an effective stop to enforced, speculative, adventurous, and spasmodic immigration. And also pass my other bill, now before the committee, which provides for the Bureau of Information and Distribution, and within a short space of time you will hear no complaints from anywhere against any class of immigrants in particular and immigration in general. Let us pass these bills and help them along rather than restrict their coming. Our country is so great in area that we can accommodate all who desire to avail themselves of our institutions, and the undeveloped resources of the land are so tremendous that it will require many, many years of diligent labor to develop them. Besides, there is Canada, Mexico, Central America, and the great South American Republics where immigration is desired and welcomed, and I am of the opinion that within a very short space of time the immigration into this country will fall off to such an extent that our commerce and industry will feel the effect. The reason for this is evident from the fact that Canada and our neighboring Republics are offering many inducements for immigration upon which you are now trying to impose so many restrictions. These countries are spending large sums of money annually to secure immigration, and it will be but a few years hence when those countries will receive the greater percentage of it.

The rapid strides toward progress in Canada and the South American Republics, dormant for centuries, is amazing, and due only to new blood and immigration; and it is a truism that where new fields of opportunity are opened thither the tide of immigration flows.

The prejudice which now asserts itself against the immigrant from southern and southeastern Europe is identical to that which was prevalent in the early days of German and Irish immigration, the selfsame element which leaped to conclusions without familiarizing themselves with pertinent facts and data. The good qualities of these people were not known at that time. But to-day who can deny that the Germans or the Irish do not possess the very best qualifications for American citizenship? Within the last fifty years, and since the beginning of Bohemian and Polish immigration, the Bohemians and Poles have conclusively demonstrated their worthiness of American hospitality. Three years ago I succeeded in overcoming the prejudice and bias which was exhibited toward Bohemian immigrants by showing that the Bohemian immigrant is worthy of our consideration in every respect. And in this I am borne out by statistics which prove that he stands at the helm in education, industriousness, and thrift. I dare say that no one can successfully contradict the assertion that the Germans, the Irish, the Bohemians,

the Poles, Swedes and Norwegians, and the Danes are not desirable immigrants. They have all proven beyond doubt their worthiness, and their citizenship has given us eminent satisfaction. Every student of economics will show, and every honest and unprejudiced historian demonstrates, that Jewish immigration has greatly aided and benefited our country by opening and enlarging our commercial marts, finding new markets for our products, and in other ways has helped to make this country the first commercial country in the world. The progressiveness of the Jewish immigrant has in numerous other ways resulted advantageously to the entire country.

There is the Polish immigrant, ever loyal, sincere, and industrious. Long before the emigration of the Pole to America has his worth and desirability been demonstrated, for in the days of the Revolution those eminent and valiant Poles, Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, and Count Casimir Pulaski, whose statues we will shortly unveil in this city, fought by the side of the immortal Washington for our freedom from the despotism and oppression of England. My only regret is that our Bohemian and Polish immigration is not larger.

Mr. Chairman, careful observation and study of the inhabitants and conditions existing among the inhabitants of southern and south-eastern Europe will reveal conditions quite opposite to those presumed to exist there, and the people will surely earn your sympathy rather than condemnation. It goes without saying that some of these people are guilty of offenses, but not any more so than others. Humanity was never destined to be perfect, and we must allow for the reasonable misgivings of our fellow-beings. I desire to quote a few pertinent statistics in this connection:

Division.	White prisoners of known nativity.			
	Per cent native.		Per cent foreign born.	
	1904.	1890.	1904.	1890.
Continental United States.....	76.3	71.8	23.7	28.3

These figures are taken from the last special report of the Census Bureau, and are based upon investigations which were made in 1904, and it is evident that great care and caution has been exercised in compiling these figures, inasmuch as the work undertaken required three years' time to complete. This report was published in 1907. These figures conclusively demonstrate that the percentage of foreign-born inmates of our reformatory and penal institutions has been constantly decreasing, notwithstanding that these figures were based upon the foreign-born population as reported in the Census of 1900. It must be taken into consideration that the millions of immigrants who have arrived in this country have not been counted in this report, and yet the figures show that while the foreign population has greatly increased, the percentage of offenders has decreased. On the other hand, the percentage of native prisoners has increased. And this report shows that the crimes of a grave nature committed by foreign-born prisoners is extremely small, most of the convictions being upon

minor charges, usually the infraction of municipal ordinances. I have frequently heard certain gentlemen before this committee charge that the present immigration is below the standard of the immigration which we have been receiving up to 1890, and that it fills our charitable and penal institutions. These are but bare statements unsupported by any facts, and are easily disproved by our own data on these matters. It only goes to show that they are merely bent upon a mighty effort to restrict immigration, and will even slander and libel the immigrants to accomplish their deplorable object.

It is true, and therefore I admit, that a certain percentage of these people are to some extent illiterate, but that is not their fault. They are deprived of every opportunity in their native countries for mental advancement. We are sending our missionaries and spending millions of dollars to educate people in uncivilized countries who are nowhere as near to us in race, color, and other attainments as these new arrivals, and our unsolicited charity is resented. The spirit of our institutions are best subserved by helping those people who of their own volition seek to throw off the yoke of ignorance and oppression which is forced upon them in their native countries.

The immigration of Slovaks, Slovenians, Croatians, Italians, and Lithuanians is but of recent origin. These people are helping along in the progress of our nation—they are producers. They are all thrifty and industrious, and idleness is wholly unknown to them. They are not beggars, and they do not subsist upon charity; they work, and work hard to support themselves and their loved ones. And no doubt within a few years they too will demonstrate to the country that they are unjustly classified as “undesirables.” They will prove their worth beyond any doubt.

Mr. Chairman, my motive for presenting the cause of these people before you arises purely from the standpoint of justice and fair play. I am not expecting any political reward at their hands. In my district I have quite a large number of Slovaks, Slovenians, Croatians, and Lithuanians, but there is only a small percentage of them who are citizens; not because they are not anxious and desirous to avail themselves of that great privilege, but because our excessively harsh and strict naturalization laws preclude them from attaining those coveted rights. Nevertheless, they are good people. They are hard workers, industrious, honest, and law abiding. They live in model homes neatly and cleanly furnished (as is also shown by the Immigration Commission report), and they make every effort to educate their children properly, and they are rapidly accustoming themselves to American ways and manners.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I have no Italians in my district, and so what I say in behalf of Italian immigration will certainly not redound to my political advantage. However, I formerly presided for many years as magistrate in a district in my city which is densely populated with these people, and by coming in close contact with them I have been able to learn a great deal about their habits and customs. I want to give testimony here that they are as a whole a sturdy, hard-working, honest, and industrious class of people, and their standard of morality is high. Why should we discriminate against them? I regard the publicity which these people have

received at the hands of the American press on account of the so-called "Black Hand" crimes, most unfortunate. However, I know that they are doing everything in their power to eliminate and wipe out the stigma cast upon their nationality by a few degenerates. They have organized societies to accomplish their purposes in this direction, and in every instance they have given every possible aid to the authorities to apprehend the "Black Handers," and have offered their united cooperation so that the ends of justice would be subserved and the offenders properly punished. I know from personal experience that they have no compassion for men of their nationality who bring disgrace and dishonor upon them. Therefore we ought to help and encourage them, and not condemn them because a minute portion of their countrymen commit a few wrongs. Let us be charitable to our unfortunate fellow-beings.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I sincerely trust that you will regard this problem of immigration as I do, and I indulge the hope that you will concur in my views and vote and legislate accordingly.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
April 21, 1910.

Hon. William S. Bennet, a member of the committee, having authority, by vote of the committee, to extend his remarks on the question of restricting immigration, submitted a carefully prepared statement relative to "Emigration as a result of legal situation of the Jews in Russia," which was sent to him from that country.

(The statement follows:)

Jews have lived in Russia from very ancient times. There are, for instance, traces of the presence of Jews in Crimea already in the first century after the birth of Jesus Christ. They lived still earlier in the Caucasus and in Transcaucasia. In northern Caucasia and on the lower banks of the Volga, in the tenth century was consolidated the Khosar Empire, the rulers and the upper classes of which professed the Jewish religion and among the inhabitants of which were many Jews by race. This Khosar Empire extended over the whole of southern Russia, from the Volga to the Dnieper and from the Black and Caspian seas to the river Oka. In Kieff, in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, a certain part of the town was inhabited by Jews.

But in later times of Russian history, when the Moscow Empire sprang up, the Jews played no part in it, the Moscovite princes and tsars forbidding the Jews to cross their boundaries. This continued until the end of the eighteenth century. At the time of the first and second divisions of Poland, Russia became possessed of the provinces of White Russia, Volhynia, and Podolia. At the final fall of the Polish Kingdom, in 1795, Russia further gained Lithuania and Kurland. Together with these provinces, the Russian Empire acquired a population of 900,000 Jews. It was then that there arose for the Russian Government the so-called "Jewish question."

What attitude did the Government assume toward the million new subjects delivered by fate into its hands? Apparently rather an unstable one.

In the manifesto published at the annexation of White Russia in 1772, General Governor Count Chernysheff declared in the name of the Empress Catherine II, that each and every individual should be guaranteed freedom of religion and inviolability of property.

It is self-understood—

Adds the manifesto—

that the Jews inhabiting the lands and towns annexed by the Russian Empire will continue to enjoy the same freedom with regard to their religion and property till now enjoyed by them. Her Imperial Majesty, in her great love for humanity, will not suffer them alone to be excluded from the mercy and future blessings of her reign, so long as they, professing themselves her loyal subjects, will continue to occupy themselves as hitherto with trade and commerce, each according to his condition.

In 1784 the Jews of White Russia presented a petition to the Empress in which they complained of oppression on the part of the administration and begged that the Jews should be allowed equal rights with the rest of the population in the choice of town counselors and judges; also that during the settling of disputes between Jews and Christians in the public courts a certain number of the members of the tribunal should be chosen from the Jewish community. In answer to this petition appeared the senatorial ukase (1786) which partly fulfilled the requests of the Jews.

In this ukase is expressed the following notable decision of the Empress Catherine:

Whereas the above-mentioned inhabitants of Jewish faith—

The Jews of White Russia—

have, by strength of former ukases been raised to an equality with others, it is imperative upon every occasion to observe the principle that each according to his estate and calling should enjoy the privileges and rights which are his, without distinction of religion and nationality.

However, notwithstanding the proclamation of the governmental principle of Jewish equality, a law regarding those Jews inscribed as citizens and merchants was passed at the end of Catherine's reign (1794) imposing taxes upon them to twice the amount paid by the Christians.

The government of Emperor Alexander I was likewise not quite free from fluctuations in the Jewish question.

At the beginning of the reign, the tendency of raising the Jews to Russian citizenship by measures of enlightenment prevailed. In 1802 Alexander I summoned a committee to discuss the question of the amelioration of the conditions of the Jews in Russia. Two years later, in 1804, the fruit of the committee's labor was sanctioned by the Emperor, "The act regulating Jewish rights."

The project of Jewish enlightenment stands first in the plan of the act. Jews were to be allowed an entry into the Russian educational establishments and encouraged to spread among them the use of the Russian tongue. The Jews were divided into four classes—agriculturists, manufacturers, artizans, merchants, and townsfolk. The agriculturists received considerable privileges with regard to taxation; but innkeeping and land jobbing were two occupations forbidden to the Jews, who were even forbidden to reside in the country.

In the act of 1804 two provinces were added to those allotted to the Jews: Astrakhan and Caucasia. These provinces collectively were given the name of the "Jewish Pale."

But in the second half of the reign of Alexander I the governmental methods changed in character. The tendency of the government to assimilate the Jews with the Christian population of the Empire was expressed, not through the medium of education, not by efforts to attract the Jews to the Russian public schools, but by attempts to spread the Christian religion among them. In the year 1817 was founded the "Society of Israelite Christians," which had missionary aims, but found little success among the Jews. At the end of the reign, in 1825, the provinces of Astrakhan and Caucasia were again excluded from the number of those which formed the Jewish Pale. The Jews were forbidden even a temporary residence in the interior provinces of the Empire and also to send goods from the frontier custom-houses to the towns of Great Russia. Until this time Jews had little frequented the interior of Russia because of want of acquaintance with the inhabitants, but now this slight intercourse ceased altogether.

Under the Emperor Nicholas I the tendency to assimilate the Jews with the Christian population became more marked and was expressed in various manners. Nicholas I removed the complete interdiction on the Jews of visiting the interior provinces. Such journeys were now permitted, but only to certain classes of Jews: Merchants, manufacturers, and artisans, and for a time not exceeding six weeks. In the "Pale" itself certain large towns were proscribed to the Jews (Kiev, Nicholaev, Sevastopol). Polish Jews, like foreign Jews, were forbidden to cross the Russian frontier. The recruiting season hung like an oppressive nightmare over the heads of the Jews. They regarded the recruiting with terror. It tore them away from their surroundings and for a lifetime (the term of service being at that time twenty-five years) and deprived them of all possibilities of living according to the dictates of their religion. The Government on its side regarded the military service as a means of "nearing" the Jews to the Christian population. The Jews were urged by all possible means to join the Christian religion. It is since that time that they have been unable to attain the rank of officers while still remaining Jews. In order to obtain more tangible results in this direction the Jews were taken from their parents as children and sent to the so-called "Cantonist schools," baptized, and in this manner transformed into Russian soldiers. The Jewish population regarded these institutions with horror and disgust. Children were torn from their parents by force or by ruse, spirited away in the dead of night; homeless Jews, Jews possessing no passport, were seized and taken as soldiers.

This gloomy epoch is still retained in the memory of the Russian Jews. Various other laws were passed with the object of attracting the Jews to Christianity. Those condemned by the courts to certain terms of imprisonment were granted freedom on condition of their becoming Christians. Monetary rewards were offered to Jews for accepting the Christian religion. To combat the Jewish "isolation" punishments were inflicted upon Jews who by their dress or outward appearance were distinguishable from the rest of the population.

Only in the last decade of the reign of Nicholas I the Government became convinced that repressive measures alone were inadequate as a means of solving the Jewish question, and that it was necessary to raise the level of their education. In 1840, at the instigation of the then minister of instruction, Uvaroff, elementary Jewish schools were

established with a general course of education, and also two "rabbi colleges" for the preparation of educated rabbis and schoolmasters. But the Jewish masses, terrorized by the repression of the Government, regarded this enterprise also with distrust and animosity, and governmental efforts in this direction had but little success.

A new epoch for Russian Jews commenced with the ascension of Alexander II to the throne.

Alexander II ascended the throne soon after the famous Crimean campaign, which ended in the complete defeat of Russia and the fall of Sebastopol. The new Emperor turned his attention to all sides of Russian life, and his greatest desire was to awaken the latent strength of the country and to lead it forth upon the path of free development. And after the emancipation of the peasants in 1861, which removed the brand of slavery from the Russian Empire, Alexander II earnestly applied himself to judicial reforms and reform in town and country administration. The result of his activity were the "Codes of procedure" of 1864, famous in modern Russian history. Then it was that public trials, juries, elective justices of peace, town and zemstvo self-government, were established. The reign of Alexander II commenced a new era in Russian life, which naturally affected the position of the oppressed and defenseless Jews. The Emperor turned his attention seriously to the position of the Jews, and at his ascension to the throne categorically expressed his desire that they should be raised to the same and equal rights with the rest of the population. In order to realize his intentions and to break the confines of the "Pale," in which the Jewish population vegetated miserably, the "Tzar-Deliverer" in 1859 conferred the right of living in any part of Russia upon the Jewish merchants of the first guild, and in 1861 he extended this privilege to all Jews who had passed through the highest educational establishments (these last were even permitted to enter governmental service). In 1865 artisans received the right of free residence throughout the Empire for purposes of their trade, and at length, in 1867, retired soldiers received the same right. Jews were allowed to take part in town and zemstvo self-governing institutions. In this manner the greater part of the Jewish population were free to leave the "Pale" and to live in any part of the country on equal terms with the Christians. Under the protection of these new liberating acts, a considerable number of Jews began to quit the "Pale," life within which was growing more and more oppressive. More than that, under influence of a tolerant administration, which yielded to the liberal tendencies of the times, a large number of Jews began to leave the "Pale" without any legal right at all, some making toward the central towns, others toward the Baltic provinces. This permeation, commencing at first gradually and cautiously, became in course of time quite a natural phenomena. Restraining laws were applied with less severity than formerly. Toward the end of the reign of Alexander II the Russian population was expectantly hoping for the final establishment of legality in the country, and the Jews for their complete emancipation.

The assassination of Alexander II put an end to these hopes. The Russian Government, at the accession of Alexander III, set out determinedly upon the path of reaction; its mediæval institutions were again proclaimed to be sacred and unchangeable; and its reactionary

measures placed the whole country, and the Jews especially, in the unbearable situation in which it is to-day. The new reign opened with an outburst of "pogroms" upon the Jewish population, which preyed upon all the towns of southern Russia, and echoed here and there in various other parts. We will touch upon this phenomena peculiar to Jewish life later on, but now we will resume our short outline of the legislating activity of the Government. At this time Plehve's influence began to be felt, and Pobiedonostzeff became omnipotent at court. Soon after the "pogroms" followed, on the 3d of May, 1882, the publication of the ill-famed "temporary laws," which have been in operation since that time and which are chiefly responsible for that continual unemployment from which the Jewish population of Russia suffer so cruelly. The old restrictive laws forbidding the Jews the buying or renting of land, even within the "Pale," and the right of habitation outside the given towns and boroughs of the "Pale," were again brought severely into force. These "temporary laws," their severity augmented by administrative orders, affected some provinces to such an extent that nearly the whole Jewish population of the villages of those provinces were forced to move back to the towns within the "Pale." Besides which many small villages were administratively changed into villages, so as to achieve the banishment of the Jews from those parts.

The "temporary laws" not only ousted the Jews from agriculture (the principal branch of Russian industry); it hindered them even in their trading and artisanship, which are closely connected with village life.

Not long after the appearance of the "temporary laws" in 1883, a high commission was founded under the presidency of Count Palen. It collected the rich materials upon the Jewish question, and, after a wide investigation of it, the commission, consisting exclusively of highly placed bureaucrats, arrived at the conclusion that the "system of repression and exceptional laws alone has outlived its time and has proved to be wrong. Therefore it is necessary to resort to another, opposite course." "Measures of legislation on the Jews," declared the commission, "should have but one aim—the extinction of any special Jewish legislation; that is to say, the gradual (even if slow) equalization of the rights of the Jews with those of all other subjects of the Empire."

Thus in the first half of the reign of Alexander III representatives of the Russian bureaucracy, remembering the traditions of the preceding reign, still expressed themselves, though timidly, for the emancipation of the Jews.

However, the report of the commission was not approved by the emperor, and during the second half of the reign of Alexander III not a year passed without some new law limiting the rights of the Jews. Expulsions en masse of the Jews from their place of residence became matters of daily occurrence. In 1886 began the limitation of the admission of Jews into the educational establishments. In 1887 Rostov and Taganrog were excluded from the "Jewish Pale." In 1888 Finland was closed to the Jews. In 1889 the right of becoming barristers and lawyers was restricted for the Jews. In 1890 obstacles were placed to their participating in shareholding companies. By force of the law of 1891, 30,000 Jewish artisans were expelled from

Moscow and the Moscow Province. Similar expulsions took place from all the interior provinces of Russia, while from the large provinces of Don, Kuban, and Terek every Jew without exception was expelled. In 1893 the Jews were forbidden to give their children Christian names. In the same year Yalta was excluded from the Jewish Pale, etc.

We should have to fill many pages in order only to enumerate the many laws against the Jews issued during the second half of the reign of Alexander III.

The ascension of Nicholas II did not introduce any substantial changes in the method of dealing with the Jews. The restraining legislation continued to increase, although not so rapidly, and the noose thrown around the Jewish people was constantly tightened.

Let us now summarize briefly the legal situation of the Jews in Russia in order to show the chief causes which make their lives so unbearable and which so forcibly impel them to cross the ocean. All the restrictive laws regarding the Jews may be classified into four groups:

I. RESTRICTION IN HABITATION.

Jews have no right to live freely in all parts of the Empire, but only in the small part of it which constitutes the Jewish Pale. The Pale embraces 15 provinces: White Russia, Lithuania, Ukraina, and Novorossia, i. e., the provinces of Vilna, Kovno, Grodno, Minsk, Moghilef, Vitebsk, Volhynia, Podolia, Kiev, Chernigov, Poltava, Bessarabia, Kherson, Ekaterinoslav, Crimea, and the 10 provinces of Poland.

Outside these provinces only some privileged groups of Jews have the right to live, notably, merchants of the first guild, i. e., the biggest traders and manufacturers; Jews who have graduated in the highest educational establishments; artisans; persons who have accomplished the military service according to the old recruiting laws and their (the soldier's) descendants. However, all parts outside the Pale are not free to these privileged persons. For instance, Siberia is almost entirely closed to the Jews. A Jew condemned by the law courts to deportation to Siberia is forbidden to remain there after the expiration of his term, so that habitation in Siberia for a Jew may be only acquired by committing a serious crime. The most numerous group of privileged Jews, the artisans, are forbidden to settle, not only in Siberia, but also in the Moscow provinces and in the Cossack provinces. And where the Jewish artisan still preserves the right to settle according to law this right is hedged in by so many formalities that a Jewish artisan outside the Pale lives in complete dependence upon the police, which costs him so much in the way of bribes that few artisans avail themselves of their right. Thanks to these difficulties, in spite of the comparatively favorable condition of things for tradesmen and artisans outside the "Pale," there are living now only 6 per cent of the Jewish population in other parts of Russia, and of these about half are aborigines, like the Jews of the Baltic provinces, Caucasia, and Central Asia. Although the confinement to the Pale is irksome to the Jews, it embraces a considerable territory and the Jews would be able to find more or less sufficient place within it. But even on that territory only an extremely small part is really accessible to the Jews. Thanks to the Temporary laws forbidding them to live in the villages, 3,000,000 of the Jewish population

living within the 15 provinces of the Pale are inclosed within a few hundred larger and smaller towns which are not prominent either for commerce or industry. Kiev, the most important industrial and commercial center of southwestern Russia, is closed to the Jews, as also the largest health resort, Yalta. Restrictive laws are at work in the two most important ports of the Black Sea, Sebastopol and Nicholaev. Thus the Jews are cut off not only from agriculture, but also in a large degree from the other industries, as the larger industrial establishments, for instance, all sugar mills, mines, smelting, and metal works, and glass works, are situated outside the towns.

II. RESTRICTIONS IN OCCUPATION.

The most important fact here is that the Jews are entirely cut off from agriculture, the staple industry of three-fourths of the population of Russia. This is brought about not only by the interdiction upon Jews of settling outside the towns, but also by their being forbidden to buy or rent lands anywhere except in the towns. (In Poland, however, this restriction applies only to lands belonging to the peasants.)

All professions connected in some way with the State are closed to the Jews. The transfer of railways to the State during the last reign has brought with it loss of occupation for a host of Jewish railway employees, from engineers to navvies. By the establishment of spirit state monopoly about 100,000 Jews have lost their earnings. All the branches of state service are completely closed against the Jews, and in the domain of the so-called "free professions" heavy restrictions weigh upon them, so, for instance, pedagogical activity is almost inaccessible to the Jews. The legal profession is also very restricted.

III. RESTRICTIONS IN EDUCATION.

Russia is far from rich in means of education. The two and a half million rubles of the Russian budget is spent upon paying the interest upon loans, on armaments, upon new railways, on exceptionally expensive police, and administration, only a small fraction remaining for the educational needs of the people; besides which the Government until lately has looked upon public enlightenment mistrustfully. The limitations placed upon their education have been one of the heaviest blows aimed at the Jewish population. The Jews, comprising nearly half of the town populations within the pale, are filled with a great longing for enlightenment. The limitation of the number of Jewish pupils in governmental schools to 10 per cent, together with the small number of educational institutions, is practically a barrier between the great mass of Jewish youth and the enlightenment so ardently desired by them. The percentage of Jewish students in the higher educational establishments is made still smaller. The fixed percentage was removed in 1906 under the pressure of the revolutionary movement; but the victory of reaction has again brought it into force. Not content with forbidding the governmental schools to the Jews, the Government until last year placed every obstacle in the way of their opening private schools of their own, and, considering the cultivation of the Jewish masses to be dangerous to itself, has forbidden the teaching of the Russian language in the Jewish religious schools (Heder), imposing fines upon teachers who infringe that regulation.

IV. ISOLATION FROM LOCAL SELF-GOVERNING BODIES.

In 1892 reforms were made in the local self-governing institutions, in the sense that the democratic element within them was weakened and administrative tutelage increased. The Jews were entirely shut out from zemstvo corporations. In town corporations Jewish representation was limited to 10 per cent, and this not elected by the population, but appointed by the administration. So that, even in towns of which Jews form the majority of the population, they are almost entirely deprived of any influence over the affairs of the town.

The above-enumerated restrictions placed upon the Jews in Russia are sufficient to demonstrate the distress of the Jewish population. Huddled within the towns of the pale, which, with the exception of Poland, presents absolutely no field favorable for economic progress, the Jews are forced to seek a miserable livelihood in small trading and artisanship, and even in this they are hampered, because without freedom of movement no regular trade and sale of goods is possible. By these means an amazing situation is obtained, a hundred thousand Jewish traders and artisans, ruined by mutual competition, are starving unemployed, while at the same time in the villages and the towns outside the Jewish pale trade is at a standstill for want of organization and sufficient artisans can not be found. Unemployment among the Jews exists, not because there is no work for them to do, but because they are forbidden to work in places where work is waiting to be done.

But the restrictive legislation against the Jews does not mean only the limitation of their rights. Thanks to the peculiar political construction of Russia, the administrative powers are exceptionally strong and they are very far from always adhering strictly to the paths of legality. The more a certain part of a population is without rights, the more it feels the burden of an oppressive administration. The extraordinary voluminousness, intricacy, and complication of the legislation upon Jews gives a possibility of interpreting it in very various manners, which makes the position of the Jews still more precarious and unstable. For each of their rights, however lawful, the Jews are obliged to bribe the police. A Jew authorized to live in the country by virtue of having taken up his abode there before the law of 1882 is nevertheless obliged to pay for the right, or he is liable at any moment to be banished from the place. Even if, by appealing to the Senate, he succeeds in a year or so to establish his right of residence in such a spot, he can not repair the damage caused to himself, his home and property by his former expulsion.

As a Russian writer has recently expressed it, "Each restrictive measure passed against the Jews is a living source of bribes for the Russian policeman," a fact which causes the local administrators to stand firmly for such legislation and upon every occasion to assure the Central Government of its necessity. The way in which the arbitrary measures of the Government are applied is exasperating in itself. It is enough to call to mind the famous Kiev "beats" (oblavy). "Oblavy" means in Russian a certain form of the hunt in which the hunters close in on all sides upon their prey to slaughter it. This term is very applicable to the method of seizing the "illegally domiciled" Jews in Kiev. In the dead of night the police surround the vicinity in which the Jews are supposed to be living, burst into the houses, sparing neither the peace of mind of inoffensive people

nor the shame of women. All those living illegally are dragged to the prisons and afterwards sent under convoy, together with criminals, from prison to prison until they finally reach the place of their "legal" habitation. Needless to say that the visits of Jews to Kiev, a town situated in the very middle of the Pale and connected with innumerable branches of economic activity, are absolutely inevitable.

While placing the Jews in such humiliating conditions, deprived of every right, the Russian Government nevertheless deems it just that they should be made to fulfill all the obligations of citizenship, even to a greater extent than the Christian population. The Jews are required to provide more soldiers comparatively than the Christians, and when they, because of emigration, are unable to provide a sufficient number of healthy recruits, they are made to pay heavily in proportion to the lack and accused of evading the-recruiting laws.

But however difficult the legal position of the Jews in Russia, and however heavily the tyranny of the Government may oppress them, these things are not yet the crowning tragedy of their lives to-day.

The most terrible feature of the lives of the Russian Jews is the "pogrom." Protection of life and property are two things which even the rulers of barbarous countries feel called upon to guarantee their subjects. But this protection is not accorded to the Jews in Russia at the present time. The first extensive "pogrom" took place soon after Emperor Alexander III mounted the throne. The minister of the interior was at that time Count Ignatieff and the director of the department of police the famous von Plehve. At that time already the "pogroms" were remarkable for certain peculiar features. The last had taken place not in small out-of-the-way places in which the Government had no armed force at command, but in large towns, filled with soldiers. The Government, which in every case of "pogrom" had displayed a remarkable indifference, in many cases clearly permitted them. During many of the "pogroms," especially those of the cruellest nature, disinterested witnesses declared that the soldiers called to the spot not only failed to disperse the "pogrommists," but even served them as a kind of escort. While the government press tried to explain the "pogroms" as the result of the instinctive hatred of the populace towards the Jews, several of the "pogrommists" themselves declared in a court of law that they bore no hatred whatever toward the Jews, but took part in the "pogrom" because some persons unknown had assured them that "the Tzar had ordered the Jews to be beaten and that no punishment would follow." It was very strange that as soon as Count Ignatieff relinquished the ministry of the interior to Count D. Tolstoy, and a circular was issued that the local governors would be answerable to the central powers for allowing disorders, the "pogroms" ceased of themselves, without the slightest effort of administration. In view of the public depression which reigned in the country after the victory of reaction, the secret of the "pogroms" of the eighties remained but little investigated.

More than two decades passed.

The minister of the interior was then Von Plehve, the former director of police under Ignatieff in 1881. The Government was engaged upon a struggle with the revolutionary movement now grown to be a considerable force and much more dangerous to the autocratic régime. Then suddenly, unexpectedly, the Kishenef

"pogrom" fell like a scourge upon the Jewish population. It differed essentially from the pogroms of the eighties: these latter had been chiefly confined to attacks upon property, but here, side by side with these, attacks upon the persons of Jews took place. Numerous mutilated corpses, hundreds of persons crippled, and women outraged, such horrors that had not occurred since long within the boundaries of Europe. And this time it was palpable that the police and gendarmes not only patronized but also participated in the pogrom.

The longer the struggle between the Government and the revolutionary movement continued, the more frequent were the pogroms. Their deep significance became apparent. In the eighties the town populations were perhaps easily incited to plunder, but during the last few years some degree of culture and consciousness has been spread among them. Participation in "pogroms" has become less attractive to them, and not seldom have occasions occurred when the more conscientious elements of the Christian population have endeavored to protect the Jews. In order to incite a pogrom it has become necessary to spread a wide Chauvinistic agitation, to give rise to rumors that the Jews have killed Christian children, that they wish to overthrow the church, etc. On the other side, the Jews, despairing of the protection of the authorities, have begun to act in defense of their own lives, property, and honor. There has appeared a danger of the "pogrommists" being overpowered by the Jews, so that troops are summoned to the "pogroms," not to use their arms against the "pogrommists," but against the Jewish self-defenders. At a given signal in October of 1905, pogroms began over nearly the whole of Russia. They were each conducted upon a certain plan, of one and the same pattern. Bands of "pogrommists" carrying flags with troops before and behind them, moved through the streets, laying waste to Jewish property and murdering Jews. The attempts of the Jews at self-defense brought upon them volleys of rifles and even of cannons (in Kishenef). The evident organizers of the "pogroms," in the ranks of the administration were not made answerable for them, but even received rewards and promotions (the commander of the Bielostock garrison, Colonel Schreiter; Colonel Tikhanovsky, in Siedletz, etc.). Those who were brought to trial were generally members of the mob, who had but played the rôle of blind tools in the hands of the provocators. These were usually condemned to some slight punishment, but for the most part were liberated by imperial order through the intercession of the Union of Russian Men (in Ovidiopol, Kertch, Tula, etc.). The rôle of the bureaucrats was in this way revealed, and when the former minister of the interior, Prince Urussov, in his famous speech in the first Douma acknowledged that he had discovered the existence of a special secret office in the department of police for the manufacture of proclamations inciting the population to "pogroms" and from whence instructors in the art of the "pogrom" were sent out, he openly confirmed before the whole world that which had been suspected long before; and the then minister of the interior, M. Stolypine, could only promise that this shocking state of things should cease to exist. Nevertheless, after that occurred the "pogrom" in Siedletz.

In order to show in figures the extent of the "pogroms," let us mention that from the 17th of October, 1905, till the end of 1906, 661 towns and cities were devastated, that 38,000 families, or 162,000 persons suffered. General loss during the last "pogroms" amounted

to 54,153,853 roubles, 985 persons were killed, 1,492 wounded heavily, while the number of those wounded in a lesser degree amounted to many thousands, 387 women were widowed, 177 children completely orphaned, while 1,474 were deprived of one of their parents.

But one can not estimate the damage done by the pogroms in mere figures. Completely destroying the safety of property, the "pogrom" ruins credit, brings about an economic crisis, and throws tens of thousands unemployed workmen into the streets. Still more terrible is the effect of the "pogroms" upon the moral atmosphere prevailing among the Jews. The knowledge that in the full light of day in the sight of everybody, a crowd of the lowest rabble may burst into your house, plundering and murdering, destroying all that you have toiled for, may violate the honor of those who are dearer than life itself, may maim or kill you, while those who are set to preserve your security will at best remain passive spectators of these events, and at worst may take active part in them—the knowledge that it is useless to struggle, because behind the "pogrommists" armed force is ranged against you—such knowledge paralyzes the energy of people, causes them to fly without retrospection, without calculation, only to escape from the threatening horrors of the "pogrom." And in such conditions the Jewish population have existed for many years. In some towns, such as Odessa, the "pogrom" is no extraordinary occurrence, but a chronic phenomena holding the Jews in perpetual state of panic.

We have said enough to illustrate the principal reasons of Jewish emigration from Russia. The Jews emigrate to various countries, but principally to the United States. The emigration statistics of the United States give us the exact figures upon the subject.

Though before 1889 we have only the figures of the total emigration (including non-Jewish) from Russia to the United States, those figures fluctuate according to the difference in the position of the Jews in Russia.

In 1880–81 (from July 1 to January 30), notwithstanding the immense number of emigrants which had already passed from Europe to the United States, only 10,500 emigrants came from Russia. In the following year, 1881–82, the year of "pogroms" and the ministry of Count Ignatieff, the number of emigrants from Russia rose to 21,500. But in the following year, 1882–83, when pogroms were forbidden, because of a change of ministry, the number of Russian emigrants suddenly fell to 11,920. However, under the influence of the temporary laws, issued on the 3d of May, 1882, forbidding the Jews to reside in the towns and villages outside the "Pale" and the cultivation of land, the emigration from Russia began to grow. Already in 1883–84 the number of emigrants from Russia had reached 17,000, and grew in proportion with the increase of restrictive legislation. In 1886–87 the number of emigrants from Russia had reached already 31,000. The year 1891–92 was one of the most oppressive for the Jews. Many thousand families were by administrative order exiled from villages and country estates of the southwestern part of Russia. Thirty thousand Jews were banished from Moscow and the Moscow Province, and the same expulsions took place in all the interior governments. In this year, 1891–92, the Jewish emigration reached the second considerable maximum of 91,000 persons. Since then emigration has been on the decrease, reaching, in 1896–97, the minimum of 25,816 persons. This was the time when the political tactics of the new Emperor, Nicholas II, had not become sufficiently definite, and the Jewish population was hoping for a better future in

Russia. In the following year statistics of the United States give us not only facts about emigration from Russia in general, but immediate figures of Jewish emigration. These figures, as we shall see, are illustrative of the wreck of Jewish hopes in Russia.

Year of emigration:	Number of Jews emi- grating from Russia.
1898-99.....	24,275
1899-1900.....	37,011
1900-1901.....	37,660
1901-2.....	37,846
1902-3.....	47,689
1903-4.....	77,554
1904-5.....	92,388
1905-6.....	125,284

The hopes placed by the Russian Jews in the reign of Nicholas II, have not been realized. The restrictive legislation has not grown milder, but even more severe, and the emigration has increased. In 1903-4, it increased with unprecedented rapidity. The reason is known and it is a political one exclusively. In April, 1903, took place the Kishenef pogrom; the Jews were seized with a panic and realized more strongly, perhaps, than they had ever done before, that they lacked even the elementary conditions of personal security. In the beginning of 1904 the war broke out and in the beginning of 1905 the revolutionary movement. The war and the revolution together disorganized the economic life of Russia, and the Jews as an industrial and commercial people felt the influence of these events the most keenly. The number of emigrations increased, especially from the most commercial parts of Russia, Poland, from whence until then, but a small number of Jews had emigrated. At length the pogroms of 1905 and the subsequent events transformed the Jewish emigration from Russia into a regular political stampede.

And so we will conclude. The emigration of Jews from Russia is not the outcome of some deep economical phenomena. Russia is a comparatively sparsely populated country, and the demand for the skilled labor and artisanship which is now being transferred to the United States is especially great. So that the Jews are emigrating not because it is impossible for them to find sufficient earnings in Russia, but because the Government deprives them of these earnings; and more than that, deprives them of the most elementary conditions of security of life and property. Thus we can foretell the future of Jewish emigration. It is entwined with the political conditions of Russia. Let but the "pogroms" cease and the emigration of the Jews will immediately and considerably diminish and will resume those insignificant proportions which it displayed until the "pogrom" of Kishenef.

(Mr. Bennet also submitted the following letters relative to the collection of the head tax on arriving aliens. The letters are self-explanatory, and follow:)

NEW YORK, February 21, 1910.

HON. WILLIAM S. BENNET,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BENNET: Please pardon the apparent delay in acknowledging the receipt of your letter of the 17th instant. I have been absent from the city for some time, and your letter just reached me this morning.

In your letter you say: "The charge is made before our Committee on Immigration of the House that by administrative order the amount of head tax which could have been collected was lessened." This is positively the first time that I have heard that any such order was in existence. It certainly was never called to my attention, and I can positively say that in the part I had in the administration of the Department of Commerce and Labor, covering a period of about seven months, the law as it reads in the statutes was strictly construed.

I am aware of no failure to collect the head tax, nor am I aware of any regulation adopted for the purpose of either increasing or decreasing the amount of head tax, nor am I aware of any change in the administration of the law which would make it easier for persons to be admitted into the country who would not be plainly entitled to admission under the law.

Yours, sincerely,

ORMSBY McHARG.

THE IMMIGRATION COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., February 14, 1910.

Hon. WILLIAM S. BENNET, M. C.,
House of Representatives, City.

MY DEAR MR. BENNET: Responsive to your oral inquiry I beg to state that during my term of office as Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Labor no administrative order having the effect of waiving head tax on immigrants was issued. Neither do I know of any instance before or since my term of office where any order was issued effecting such waiver. The law, as you know, is explicit in regard to the collection of the head tax and no authority is vested in the administering officer by which such waiver can legally be made.

Very sincerely, yours,

WM. R. WHEELER.

REGIA AMBASCIATA D'ITALIA,
Washington, D. C., February 9, 1910.

MY DEAR MR. BENNET: In reply to your note of the 3d instant, I beg to herewith transmit to you, in English translation, copy of the decree issued by the royal commissioner-general of immigration upon the 31st of May, 1907, after the head tax had been raised from \$2 to \$4.

I may add that if the increase amounted to 12 lire instead of 10, as it should have been, it was because the companies called attention to the fact that, whilst the head tax is paid by the head (adult or child), the rates are in proportion with the age (whole berth, half a berth, a fourth of a berth, etc.).

Believe me, my dear Mr. Bennet, yours, very truly,

E. MAYOR DES PLANCHES.

Hon. W. S. BENNET,
Member of Congress, Washington.

Decree of the department of emigration changing the maximum rates for the transportation of emigrants to the United States, established for the last four months of 1907.

Upon the requests made by emigrant carriers that changes be made in the rates for the lines to the United States;

Considering that from the 1st of July next the head tax for emigrants entering the United States will be increased from \$2 to \$4 per person;

Considering the opportunity of increasing the rates in such measure as will not cause the emigrant carriers to suffer owing to the increased head tax;

Upon the favorable opinion of the general director of the mercantile marine, decrees that the maximum rates for the second four months 1907 for the lines to the United States be increased to 12 lire for full passage, and only for emigrants who will actually land in the United States, starting from the 1st of July, 1907.

The above decree will be published in the Official Gazette of the Kingdom.

Rome, May 31, 1907.

L. REYNAUDI,
The Commissioner-General.

HEARINGS ON IMMIGRATION BILLS.

THE COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *Saturday, May 21, 1910.*

The committee this day met, Hon. Benjamin F. Howell (chairman) presiding.

Others present were: Representatives Burnett, Edwards, Johnson, and Sabath.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed, gentlemen.

Mr. WEITZEL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have the honor of presenting to you to-day the Rev. M. D. Lichliter, of Pennsylvania, the chaplain of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, who will address you in a general way on the subject of immigration, which this order had declared to be one of its principles.

I have now the honor and pleasure of introducing Reverend Lichliter.

STATEMENT OF REV. M. D. LICHLITER, HARRISBURG, PA.

Reverend LICHLITER. I will present the statement of our order in a general way, and I will be obliged for the courtesy of being permitted to present it without any cross-questioning so as to preserve its continuity. As the gentleman, Mr. Weitzel, the national vice-councilor, has a statement to make and your time is precious, I ask that as a courtesy.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, at the request of the national legislative committee, all present here to-day and composed of Mr. E. C. Lafean, Mr. Reinhard Schwald, and Mr. John H. Noyes, and Mr. John J. Weitzel, representing the national board of officers, I appear before you to represent the Junior Order United American Mechanics. As an organization we are nonsectarian and nonpartisan, founded upon patriotism, love of country being the chief cornerstone. As with all associations of a fraternal character, we are mutually helpful to each other, our wives and children. We stand prominently for the public school system of America and oppose sectarian interference therewith.

The question of restricted immigration has been increasingly before our order for twenty years; in fact we were among the first to call the attention of the American Congress to the evils growing out of the "open-door" policy of the Government, resulting particularly from its recent changed character and by which the "undesirables" from foreign countries have been entering our portals by the millions.

I wish to state, by way of preface, that as an organization, the Junior Order United American Mechanics is not opposed to the immigration idea. We believe in immigration—that there has been a

need for it, that there is still room for more—but only of the better sort. Tracing ourselves back from three to five generations, we all find ourselves absorbed, through our progenitors, in the peoples of the old world. These progenitors were moved by a common impulse and hope. The Constitution formed in the cabin of the *Mayflower* began, “In the name of God, amen. For the glory of God and the maintenance of the Christian faith.” These words became the watchwords of the world’s millions of men and women from other lands who voluntarily sought in the New World a home and freedom from oppression.

We needed them—our mighty domain then called for them to build our cities, run our industries, construct our railroads, and till our soil; but that public domain is now gone. No wonder Abraham Lincoln, in his Thanksgiving proclamation of 1864 called upon the people of the land to thank God that “He has augmented our free population by immigration.”

But, as Lord Beaconsfield once said, in defending a change of national policy of England, “A good many things have happened since then.” Every phase of the immigration problem has changed since the days of Lincoln, just as it has with regard to our forestry and conservation policy. The immigration of the present is not the immigration of forty years ago. The problem confronting us in this the opening of the second decade of the twentieth century is entirely different than at that time, because we are receiving, in the main, a different type of immigrant. We have rightly excluded the coolie. While with open arms our order welcomes our kith and kin and blood as that of forty years ago, we do protest against the admission of those who come into this country whose habits and manner of life tear down the standard of American life, of living, and of wages, and whose traits of character, formed under the condition under which they have existed as races for centuries, possessing a low order of intelligence and an inferior standard of life, renders it impossible, even if they had the desire, to maintain the highest ideals of American morality and citizenship.

In studying the early immigration to this country we learn that it was mostly composed of people of the Celtic and Teutonic blood. They came from that people who made the present civilization of the world and aided in building up the splendid national structure of the United States of America. These early immigrants came of their own initiative to better their condition, to free themselves from the Old World oppression, to find a home, and at once they became a part of this great country, settling in the rural districts, and were on the firing line and in the trenches when their presence was needed. They were the better part of the nations from which they came—morally, mentally, and physically; in the main they were intelligent, industrious, frugal, law respecting, and liberty loving, and as such assimilated with the native born with marvelous facility. They contributed to our statesmanship, to our literature, to our commerce, to our agriculture, and to all other avenues of industry. They belonged to that independent race of men of the Aryan blood who, when they left their homes in the Caucasus Mountains, came with the idea already embedded in their hearts and minds of the beauties of self-government. That ancient people were not governed by a monarchical form of government, as the present influx is. When a

chief died, his son did not succeed him, but instead the candidates for the office of chief laid their shields upon the ground and the warriors, as electors, threw their swords into the shield of the man whom they wanted as ruler, and the one who had the greatest number of swords on his shield was declared the ruler or chief. This principle the Aryans brought from their mountain fastnesses. It was the same principle that worked in the blood of the American patriot when he stood in the trenches of Bunker Hill and suffered at Valley Forge. It was from this Aryan blood that immigration came previous to 1875. They did not come because they were assisted by others, they did not come because some one paid their passage to get them out of the old country, but they came because they wanted to be free. They came to get rid of the oppression of their old home. They came not at the behest of the agents of the steamship lines or the agent of the large American industries, sent over to buy labor as by auction, in the market, to drive out American labor from our great mills. No; they came at their own behest, and did not all settle down in the centers of American life to congest it, but struck out into the prairies and forest to build homes for themselves and families.

It is very interesting to study the comparison of the immigration that came three or four decades ago with the present influx of aliens. In 1820, from which date we have computation of the arrival of aliens, 8,385 souls came. In 1905, 1,026,499 landed on our shores, having passed through our wide-open gates. During this time and up to June 30, 1909, 26,856,723 have entered our portals. Up to 1877 the majority came from northern Europe and was of the Anglo-Saxon blood, mixed with the Celtic and Teutonic, which originally came from the Aryan race.

Let us notice by way of contrast the immigration of 1854 and 1905—fifty years of comparison. In 1854, 48,901 English, 4,605 Scotch, 101,606 Irish, 13,317 French, 215,000 Germans, and 3,531 Norwegians emigrated to America. During the same year 1,363 came from Italy and only 14 came from the vast Empire of Russia. Fifty years after England sent over only 26,218 souls; 6,153 came from Scotland, 35,000 from Ireland, and 40,000 from Germany, while on the other hand Russia dumped on our shores 136,093 souls and Italy sent over 230,622 more. In 1905 Austria-Hungary furnished 206,000 persons. In 1854 not a single soul came from that country. Though late in starting to emigrate to America, from these three great European countries more than 6,000,000 have entered our portals.

WE CAN NOT ASSIMILATE THIS NEW ENORMOUS INFLUX.

The baleful influence of such a low type of immigration on our civilization, labor, morals, and citizenship is patent to every observer. How much of this emigration in later years is undesirable is difficult to compute. Those who have made it a study differ in their estimates. But enough is shown, even by conservative estimates, that a large percentage of them should not have been permitted to enter.

A few years ago a member of the Immigration Commission, who studied the question carefully, stated that from 1890 to 1902 of the 5,000,000 immigrants that had entered our portals 4,000,000 of them should not have been permitted to enter. That estimate may be

too large. But if the statements of other immigrant inspectors and the records of the commissioner-general are correct, at least one-half are undesirable. The latest account I have is from a gentleman in New York, who studied the problem the past year, who stated that at least 225,000 that entered our gates were not desirable.

Taking the immigration for a year as a whole, a large per cent can not read nor write, thus filling this country with a vast army of illiterates. In 1907, according to the Annual Report of the Commissioner-General, 751,786 came to our country, of which 191,141 could neither read nor write. It has been computed that if the illiterates had been denied admission to this country—that is, those who could neither read nor write—from 1896 to 1907, 1,829,320 would have been denied admission. Add to this the great number of those who were undesirable because of their habits, customs, and criminal tendencies, what a vast host would have been excluded from our shores. To prevent the coming of this great army of illiterates and undesirables, we ask of you, gentlemen, a favorable consideration of the Hayes bill and Elvins bill now before you.

It is not what a man eats that makes him big and strong, but what his system assimilates. The boy thinks that the more he eats the sooner he will be a man; that the more potatoes, cabbage, etc., he takes down into his stomach the quicker he will arrive at the coveted period of maturity. That is a mistake. It is not so much what he eats, but what he assimilates; what his digestive apparatus will generate through his body that gives vigor to the blood and strength to the bones. The same principle is true in the body politic. It is not so much the number of immigrants this country receives that affects us, but the kind. This country has wonderful assimilating powers and can assimilate and distribute through its body politic a great army of worthy and industrious people and those of the high moral type. But it can not assimilate the mass of lower Europe and protect its high standard of morality and good order.

The tendency of later-day immigration is to go into the great centers, already congested, and add thereto an increasing danger to the peace and good order of the public domain. It is not necessary, before so intelligent a body of men, to give extended remarks on this phase of the problem, as you know that the vast number of immigrants settle in our cities and refuse to go out on the farms. I am perfectly familiar with the fact of the inability to get immigrants to go to the country, as I am connected with the department of agriculture of my own State, Pennsylvania, and have been in touch with a society in New York which has for its purpose the sending of or inducing immigrants to go to the farms in the country. They refuse to go, and when they do and their expenses are paid they soon tire of the work and leave the farmer in a few days, out of his money and a farm hand. Many who come from Italy were reared on farms, but farming is too slow for them when they arrive here; they prefer the centers of population and any other avenue of occupation rather than work on the farm.

It is clear to every observant citizen, it seems to me, when we take into consideration the vast hordes of undesirable aliens, approximating a million a year, that are coming to us, that something will happen; in fact, something has happened. The moral fiber of the nation has been weakened and its very life-blood vitiated by the influx of

this tide of oriental scum. The Boston of to-day is not the Boston of 1775, when James Otis and Samuel Adams were the exponents of liberty. Local self-government has broken down, and Boston is now governed by two commissioners appointed by the governor. The New York of to-day is not the New York when Washington landed from the ferry to take hold of the helm of the new Republic and guide safely through the breakers the first experiment of constitutional government on the globe. In fact, as is well known, none of our larger cities of to-day are the cities of forty years ago. The illiterate, the unclean, morally and physically, the un-American, the criminally inclined, yea, the lower classes of aliens form the dangerous portion of our municipalities, and are becoming a menace to our institutions.

The gravitation of undesirable immigrants into these large cities reenforces their slum population. These slum sections furnish the bulk of criminals before our police courts and the criminal tribunals. They are the hot beds of vice and seething pots of corruption. It is particularly the illiterate that is such a fertile field for the irresponsible agitator and corrupt boss. One who gave the matter investigation a few years ago stated that in Baltimore 77 per cent of the slum population was of foreign birth or parentage; in Chicago, 90 per cent; in Philadelphia, 91 per cent, and in New York, 95 per cent. It will be seen that the nationalities which constitute the larger per cent of the slum element in these and other cities are those drawn from the least desirable immigrant; two-thirds at least of it being contributed from eastern and southern Europe, and of this element the same sections of Europe furnish the larger number of illiterates, about 60 per cent, while all other countries—Scandinavia, Great Britain, France, Germany, and Ireland furnish but 23 per cent of the illiterates of these slums, and native-born Americans contribute 7 per cent. When we consider this illiterate accession to the slums of the cities, we should recall the warning of that eminent writer and traveler, George William Curtis, "Let us beware how we water our lifeblood." That is, let us not unduly tax our assimilating powers. New York alone has a population at the present time of more than 500,000 Italians.

Visit the parks and groves near our municipalities in the summer time on the Sabbath and observe the desecrations of the Lord's day, and you will find that 97 per cent are foreigners. Take the statements of the officers of our police stations and judges of our courts, and we find that about 75 per cent tried for crimes are foreigners. The admissions to our almshouses and penal institutions has been on the increase since 1900. The most notorious criminals of the old countries find their way here, and soon are engaged in their red-handed deeds of wrongdoing. In some nations they even give a notorious criminal the option of going to prison or America, and he emigrates at once. Some countries find it cheaper and better to encourage such emigration and thus are getting rid of their dangerous element. The increase of pauperism in this country from aliens is a matter of importance to be considered. The reports of the Commissioner-General of Immigration show a constant increase. One of these reports show in one year that 28 per cent of the number in our public institutions were foreigners, and that the gain in admissions for that year was 34 per cent.

Then there is another factor that enters into the problem, when we consider the segregation of these millions of undesirables, the lower

order of immigrants into our great industrial centers—that of the menace to the peace and good order of our country in times of strikes or labor uprisings, when there is a dispute regarding the wages of the employees of the vast corporations. We need but recall the railroad riots of 1877 and the Homestead strike some years later.

My work was in the midst of those great disturbances, and I witnessed the destruction of the property of the railroad and city of Pittsburg in the disturbance of 1877, and the riotous scenes at Homestead. The wild scenes of carnage that occurred in 1877 was not brought about by the railroad employees, but by the slum element of the city, who seized the opportunity to burn and pillage, thereby entailing millions of damage which the taxpayers were compelled to pay. When the workingmen in the Homestead mills resisted the Pinkerton police, those who protected the mill were the better element of the workingmen; but when the Pinkerton's surrendered, they were treated with respect and courtesy, and were being conducted to the place of detention, quietly, when outside the works, there lined up 2,000 of the baser sort, who perpetrated upon the helpless prisoners shameful indignities, beating them, throwing dirt and sand into their faces, tripping them, and calling them by the vilest epithets, thus changing the sentiment of the country against the workingmen, and at the same time endangering the peace of the community, to such an extent that the entire state national guard was called to encamp for two or three weeks in that unfortunate town.

Gentlemen, the influence of this dangerous class does not stop with the immediate sections where they segregate in such vast numbers. As the stream partakes of the same nature as the fountain head, so the stream of moral and civil contamination flows outwardly through the land until the farthest extremity of our domain feels the rancor of the disease that festers in our congested centers of population.

There are inducements held out to encourage immigration, and these might be enumerated as fourfold:

1. Those of governmental authority in the older European countries to induce to emigrate or transport those who are paupers, criminals, or otherwise undesirable and burdensome. I have in a word referred to this. It is a fact vouched by those who have given personal inspection to the matter that there are governments which encourage such emigration, and even have societies in which dues are paid to furnish a fund whereby paupers are transported to America; in fact, public moneys are used to transport such, claiming that it is cheaper to send their pauper poor to this country than to keep them in their own poorhouses.

2. The employment of agents representing great industries to visit the human markets of Europe to hire laborers for American mills and other industrial establishments. This is so patent and so frequently referred to by immigrant officials that it is only necessary to mention the fact. In eight times out of ten an immigrant on reaching this country has a job waiting him, even if there is no job for an American. Scores of instances have come under my own observation of such gross injustice done American workmen in the interest of an alien. I have seen our own people at the mill office asking for work, and were told there was no opening, when the next minute an Italian or Slav would come to the office, with the tag of shipment still on him and

smell of steerage passage still on his clothes, who would get a job for the mere asking. I saw one day while standing on the wharf in New York a ferryboat filled with immigrants. I saw Italian padrone agents culling out the Italians and corralling them until more than 300 had been gotten together, where they were kicked and cuffed like cattle, when finally led by an agent and followed by another to bring up the rear, like driving a herd of cattle into the shambles, they were marched to the padrone headquarters where they were hired out to such parties who would pay the price for this cheap labor. The padrone agent generally gets from two to five dollars from each Italian and from two to three dollars from the firm who has bought them to install in his establishment at the expense of American laboring men.

3. Another inducement to encourage this mighty alien immigration is the oft-repeated story of the steamship companies which have their agents by the hundreds to cover such countries of Europe where there is the largest harvest of aliens to be obtained to ship steerage to America.

Upon this point the Commissioner-General of Immigration in his report of 1909, on pages 112 and 113, in giving the reasons for the "increased and increasing inflow of Iberic and Slavic people," says:

But these do not afford what is believed to be the principal, the underlying explanation. The truth of the matter is that the peasants of the countries mentioned have for a number of years supplied a rich harvest to the promoter of immigration. The promoter is usually a steamship agent, employed on a commission basis, or a professional money lender, or a combination of the two. His only interest is wholly a selfish one of gaining his commission and collecting his usury. He is employed by the steamship lines, large and small, without scruple, and to the enormous profit of such lines. The more aliens they bring over the more there are to be carried back, if failure meets the tentative immigrant, and the more are likely to follow later if success is his lot. Whatever the outcome, it is a good commercial proposition for the steamship line. To say that the steamship lines are responsible, directly or indirectly, for this unnatural immigration is not the statement of a theory but of a fact, and of a fact that sometimes becomes, indeed, if it is not always, a crying shame.

In discussing further the evils growing out of "artificial induced" immigration, the Commissioner-General adds: "It may be asserted as a general rule that stimulated immigration is undesirable. As already stated, a large part of our immigration is known to be of that character."

The fact of the promotion of immigration by steamship companies has so frequently been brought to your attention, gentlemen, that I will not take your valuable time to make further reference to it, only so far, that their opposition to this bill and similar bills is proof that they are in favor of a wide-open-gate policy. Surely the American workingman has the right to protection from this low-priced labor. And the only place these millions of workingmen of our own race, kith, and blood can get protection is from our American statesmen composing our American Congress, of whom we are asking favorable consideration of the bill in question.

4. Another inducement that encourages such a large influx of aliens, especially from Italy, and to a lesser degree from Austria-Hungary, grows out of economic conditions. This is a phase of the immigration problem very lightly touched upon and not well understood. Italy is a very populous country, and is a little larger than the area of two New York States, and has 33,000,000 people. Twenty per cent own the entire country, 40 per cent are tenants, and the other

40 per cent are laborers, at 25 to 40 cents a day. Her public debt is more than twice as large as that of the United States, to pay the interest of which requires $42\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the taxes collected, and 23 per cent more is required to support the standing army. The tax is \$81 per capita, and to meet this taxation, or rather to increase the value of her resources, the governmental authorities encourage the emigration to America of her labor population where fortunes, so far as an Italian looks at it, are quickly made, the bulk of which money is returned to Italy. Fully 500,000 emigrate to the various countries in a year, and to facilitate this gigantic movement the Government has established an emigrant department, which differs from our immigrant bureau, whose chief object is to look after those who desire to come to us. The object of the Italian bureau of emigration is to send them out, and at the same time they are urged not to become American citizens; to remain loyal to the mother country, make all the money they can, save all they can, live just as cheaply as they can, and with their surplus return to their native land, and put it in circulation for the betterment of the country, so as to make a larger resource for the nation and increase its taxable property.

The reports of the Commissioner-General show that this fact is true; that the vast majority of Italians and Hungarians do not come to stay, only so long as they can accumulate a good bank account, and then they depart. This is the reason that more men come than women. In one year out of 221,479 immigrants from Italy, only 38,000 were females—that is, the majority came not to make America their home. One year, in round numbers, 193,000 Italians came through our portals, and same year 129,000 passed out for their old home. One of the managers of the Hamburg Line said that in 1904, 575,000 entered our country through Ellis Island, and 359,000 passed out. The last report of the Commissioner-General of Immigration shows that during the calendar year of 1909, 751,786 immigrants emigrated to this country, and 192,449 nonimmigrants; and 225,802 aliens, and 174,590 nonaliens departed. In the panic year of 1908, 714,165 immigrant and nonimmigrant left the country. Of this number belonging to the immigrant class, Italy sent to us 134,246, and there returned to their old home 214,212. Same year Austria-Hungary sent to us 171,798, and those who left us for their own country numbered 177,261. According to last report of the Commissioner-General for the year 1909, those who came from Slavic and Iberic races numbered 460,005 out of a grand total of immigrants for the year of 944,235.

There is another phase of this great problem of immigration that has not been referred to by those who have studied the question, its disastrous fruits in the times of America's industrial and financial depressions. In the years of the great industrial activity, as in 1905 and 1906, more than 2,300,000 immigrants passed our portals, but when the panic or industrial depression of 1907 and 1908 came upon our country, like locusts these millions ate up our substance and left hundreds of thousands of our American workingmen on the verge of want.

Some have charged the late depression to President Roosevelt; some to Wall street and the great moneyed corporations. How much either or all these were causes for the depression, I know not; but one cause, however, has not been touched upon by apologists

for that depression—the immigrant's drain upon the nation's medium of circulation—its money—which cause is twofold.

A few weeks ago there appeared before you representatives of the railroad employees of this country, and in that hearing there was brought to your attention the cost for a month upon which an Italian or Hungarian could subsist, and how much he could save out of his income. A few years ago I had opportunity to inquire into the same phase of the immigrant question and arrived at about the same conclusion, the amounts in figures differing but slightly. The Bureau of Labor issued a pamphlet dealing with this problem. The results of that examination showed that in 89 gangs aggregating more than 1,500 men the average earnings was \$37.07 per man per month, while the cost for food per man for a month was \$5.30 and for shanty room and sundries \$1.49, leaving for each man a net surplus of \$30.27 a month.

Now, what had this to do with our late industrial depressions? Much, every way. First, the lack of the consumption of the products of the country, which meant the lack of outlay of money for same, was a drain upon the nation's wealth, because that surplus was kept from circulation. The American working man lives up to his income; hence his wages are kept in circulation, therefore keeping in good health the body politic.

But this drain from the lack of the consumption of the products of the nation with the \$30 stored away is insignificant compared with the amount of the savings for the month and year that are removed from our country to the Old World. Here is a decisive drain on the nation's wealth, it being estimated that \$200,000,000 is taken out in a year—\$75,000,000 to Italy alone, and as a compensation for this drain last year the immigrants brought with them but \$17,331,828.

President Roosevelt in his message of December 3, 1901, said:

Not only must our labor be protected by the tariff, but it should also be protected so far as possible from the presence in the country of any laborers brought over by contract, or those who, coming freely, yet represent a standard of living so depressed that they can undersell our men in the labor market and drag them to a lower level. Our present immigration laws are unsatisfactory. There should be a comprehensive law enacted with the object of working threefold improvement over our present system.

First. We should aim to exclude absolutely not only all persons who are known to be believers in anarchistic principles or members of anarchistic societies, but also all persons who are of a low tendency or of unsavory reputation. This means that we should require a more thorough system of inspection abroad and a more rigid system of examination at our immigration ports, the former being especially necessary.

The second object of a proper immigration law ought to be to secure by a careful and not merely perfunctory educational test, some intelligent capacity to appreciate American institutions and act sanely as American citizens.

This would not keep out all anarchists, for many of them belong to the intelligent criminal classes. But it will do what is also in point; that is, tend to decrease the sum of ignorance, so potent in producing the envy, suspicion, malignant passion, and hatred of order, out of which anarchistic sentiment mentally springs.

Finally, all persons should be excluded who are below a certain standard of economic fitness to enter our industrial fields as competitors with American labor.

There should be proper proof of personal capacity to earn an American living and enough money to insure a decent start under American conditions. This would stop the influx of cheap labor and the resulting competition which gives rise to so much of bitterness in American industrial life, and it would dry up the spring of the pestilential social conditions in our great cities, where anarchistic organizations have their greatest possibility of growth.

Both the educational and economic test in a wise immigration law should be designed to protect and elevate the great body politic and social. A very close super

vision should be exercised over the steamship companies which mainly bring over the immigrant, and they should be held to a strict accountability for any infraction of the law.

Immigration into the United States for the year ending June 30, 1902, was 648,743.

President Roosevelt in his message of December 2, 1902, said:

I again call your attention to the need of a proper immigration law, covering the points outlined in my message to you at the first of the session of the present Congress; substantially such a bill has already passed the House.

Immigration into the United States for the year ending June 30, 1903, was 857,046.

President Roosevelt in his message December 2, 1903, said:

The need is to devise some system by which the undesirable immigrants shall be kept out entirely, while desirable immigrants are properly distributed throughout the country.

Immigration into the United States for the year ending June 30, 1904, was 812,870.

With this increase of immigration and the alarms already sounded by Presidents McKinley and Roosevelt, the American people became aroused and at conventions held in many places in the United States, strong resolutions for the restriction of immigration were adopted. The National Conference on Immigration held in New York City on December 6-7, 1905, under the auspices of the National Civic Federation, in a resolution unanimously adopted, declared—

That the members of the national conference on immigration heartily indorse the wise suggestions of the President of the United States in his annual message to Congress regarding the enforcement and amendments of laws concerning immigration, and regarding an international conference to deal with the question.

They urged upon Congress the speedy passage of the laws required to put such recommendations into effect.

Immigration into the United States for the year ending June 30, 1905, was 1,026,499.

President Roosevelt, in his message to Congress, December 5, 1905, said:

The question of immigration is of vital interest to this country. In the year ending June 30, 1905, there came to the United States 1,026,000 alien immigrants. Moreover, a considerable proportion of it, probably a very large proportion, including most of the undesirable class, does not come here of its own initiative, but because of the activity of the agents of the great transportation companies. These agents are distributed throughout Europe, and by the offer of all kinds of inducements they wheedle and cajole many immigrants, often against their best interests, to come here. The most serious obstacle we have to encounter in the effort to secure a proper regulation of the immigration to these shores arises from the determined opposition of the foreign steamship lines who have no interest whatever in the matter save to increase the returns on their capital by carrying masses of immigrants hither in the steerage quarters of their ships.

Immigration into the United States for the year ending June 10, 1906, was 1,100,736, and for the year ending June 30, 1907, 1,285,349.

On account of the panic in the fall of 1907 the news was spread all over southern Europe that many men were out of employment in the United States, and to this is due the fact that the immigration into the United States for the year ending June 30, 1908, was 732,870.

If 343,267 immigrants alarmed President McKinley, and if 487,918 immigrants in 1901 alarmed President Roosevelt and the laboring classes and patriotic people, then the large increase of immigration

in more recent years should stir our entire citizenship to agitation and every legislative body in the nation to action.

During the month of March, 1909, the Ohio legislature (President Taft's State) passed the following resolution:

Whereas the dumping of a million immigrants into the United States annually is a fact for which the world offers no precedent and is a menace to American institutions, the American home, and the American laborer; and

Whereas there are now many bills before the Congress of the United States for the better regulation of immigration and the revision of the tariff; and

Whereas the regulation of foreign immigration is a necessary supplement to the tariff, an essential element in the protection of America from ruinous competition by cheap labor at home, ruinous in our endeavor to establish an American industrial democracy; and

Whereas a protective tariff without proper immigration regulation is a travesty on the industrial problem: Therefore be it

Resolved by the general assembly of the State of Ohio, That we respectfully ask our Senators and Representatives in Congress to enact more stringent immigration laws to protect our people, both native-born and naturalized, against wholesale immigration from foreign lands.

Similar resolutions were passed by other States.

The contention we make is that we should take care of our own people first. The argument is often made that this is a free country; that we should open our arms to everyone; that America should be the home for the downtrodden and the oppressed of all lands. Well, that is a very beautiful sentiment, one worthy of those who utter it; but my idea is that the true way to live, the true way to push forward civilization, is to build up the best standards, not to tear them down. As was recently said on the floor of the United States Senate:

It has long been our boast that America offers an asylum for the oppressed of all nations, and Liberty Enlightening the World stands beckoning such to our shores. It is time, Mr. President, that this sentiment should be relegated to the limbo of things to be forgotten, and give place to the more practical sentiment that our own must be provided for.

I believe that is our first duty as American citizens—to take care of our own families should be first before taking care of another's family; to care for our neighbors first before taking care of those who come to us, or want to come, who have no parity of feeling with us.

Self-defense is the first law of nature as well as of nations. If the Scriptural statement that the man who "careth not for his own household is worse than an infidel" is true, then the nation that permits its institutions and people to be endangered from any cause certainly, if that cause can be removed, is no less guilty of the violation of that sacred injunction, both from the standpoint of Christian and natural laws.

Charity begins at home, and while the United States has opened its gates to the earth's millions and offered an asylum to the oppressed, and a home for the unfortunate, still this great country has no right to carry its hospitality one step over the line where American institutions and American workingmen and the American standard of wages and living is brought into serious peril. Since 1900 from eight to nine millions of foreigners have entered our portals. No nation in human history ever undertook to deal with such masses of alien population. The man must be a sentimentalist and an optimist beyond all bounds of reason who believes we can take such a load upon the national stomach that can not be assimilated, thereby threatening the life and health of the Republic.

This, gentlemen, is the nation's peril and crises. The "new face at the door" is a significant fact. The fable of the camel, the tent, and the master is likely to become a reality. The face of this great camel is not only at the door, but the head and shoulders are within. How long will it be until the whole body will be within and the "dead line" is reached? It is the patriotic as well as Christian duty of our Congress to save this country from the bilge waters of foreign habits, vices, and influences.

The ancients dreamed of an island toward the setting sun, called Hesperides, a place where flowers sent forth their sweetest fragrance and where fruits ripened in every month of the year. That Hesperides is our Columbia, with its fertile valleys, its broad prairies, its golden gate, and its fair Southland. But an enemy hath entered the beautiful garden, and has gnarled its fruits and poisoned its flowers.

Troy was safe until Minerva induced its defenders to open its gates to admit the Trojan horse, when out of its belly came forth the instruments of Troy's destruction. Unrestricted immigration is the Trojan horse in our midst. From it comes our danger and ultimate destruction, unless the gates are closed against all "undesirables," so that the absorptive powers of this great nation may properly assimilate that which it has already on the national stomach.

Gentlemen, it is not necessary to enlarge on the statements I have made of facts cited, as you have them fully presented by the Commissioner-General of Immigration and the various commissions that have been studying this problem. The statements and data presented by those who are familiar with the subject, and who have studied the problem both here and abroad, should receive, as I believe they will, careful consideration from your honorable committee.

Before I sit down, there is another fact I wish to impress upon your minds. This organization I represent, with more than 400,000 members, is not the only one asking for restrictive measures at the hands of Congress. Scores of other organizations, associations, and societies are in harmony with our contention. Not only the native is asking for a restrictive measure, but naturalized and unnaturalized foreigners, who came here for a home and have made this their adopted country and are a part of our bone and sinew, are asking for such legislation, to keep out the undesirable element from their own native countries. Again, a large number of labor unions of this country have taken decided grounds for proper restriction of immigration. This statement has the verification of Mr. John Mitchell, who was for years at the head of a great labor confederation. He has been and still is a representative of labor interests, and these unions are observing the importation of cheap and pauperized as well as undesirable labor from Europe that is affecting the millions of American workingmen.

Gentlemen, if we would keep our country in the place it has fully earned, that of the foremost republic, yea, the foremost nation of the earth, we must shield it from those baleful influences growing out of unrestricted immigration that sooner or later will bring disaster to us. If we would have the mighty current of our national power move onward unchecked in the fulfillment of its great mission, we must preserve our institutions, our people, and our citizenship from the corrupting and baleful influences of Europe's undesirable

aliens, pouring in upon us, at the rate of a million a year. Our grand Anglo-Saxon character must be preserved and the pure, unmixed blood flowing down from our Aryan progenitors must not be mingled with the Iberic race, composed of the lower types of the race. We should stand for a safe and sane policy of restriction. Let the world call that selfishness if it will; after all, "National selfishness is the highest type of patriotism," as declared on one occasion by a member of the American Congress.

Gentlemen, in conclusion, I trust that the gravity of the situation confronting our country and the importance of the subject may be felt to such a degree that you will give it the most careful and thoughtful consideration. Immediate action to restrict immigration is necessary in order to protect our wage-earners against the vicious, criminal, pauper labor that is being permitted to enter our ports. We should maintain the high standard established by our American laborer. His right to such wages in order that he have a comfortable home, and a sufficient competency to enable him to educate his children and maintain his dignity as an American citizen, is unquestioned.

We look to you, gentlemen, for such legislation that will preserve and protect that standard of living and citizenship for which we contend.

I thank you, gentlemen, for your courtesy in listening to me.

STATEMENT OF JOHN J. WEITZEL, ESQ., OF CINCINNATI, OHIO, VICE-COUNCILOR OF THE JUNIOR ORDER OF UNITED AMERICAN MECHANICS.

MR. WEITZEL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I notice that the hour is half past 11, and so far as I am concerned, if it is agreeable to you gentlemen, I am willing to submit my statement to you and have it made a matter of record without reading it.

THE CHAIRMAN. There is no objection. Without reading it, it will be printed.

MR. WEITZEL. Yes. I wish to state that I came here for the express purpose of making a denial of some of the statements that are contained in the public records, and for that reason and that reason alone I came here to present this paper.

MR. BURNETT. Will you call attention briefly to the statements that you wish to deny, without going into the subject-matter of your paper there in detail?

MR. WEITZEL. Yes, sir. I wish to call attention to the statement, according to page 472 of the printed hearings, where a member of the committee states that he is reliably informed that the Junior Order is the same as the old decadent A. P. A. and is merely operating under a new name.

Another charge, on page 365, says we are engaged in a particular propaganda, and I take it the person who made the statement believed he had been informed by what he considered as reliable authority; also that the Junior Order was an anti-Catholic organization. No doubt his information came from over-zealous church enthusiasts, as, for instance, the editor of this paper here, the Morning Star, a Catholic weekly, who has several articles in the issue of April 23, 1910. I just quote some lines in one of those articles in my paper, and will not take the time to read them.

Mr. BURNETT. Your statement is that it is not anti-Catholic and nonsectarian?

Mr. WEITZEL. Yes; that it is not anti-Catholic and nonsectarian, as stated by the Rev. Mr. Lichliter. We state that fact as beyond contradiction, and we challenge anyone that makes a statement to the contrary.

Mr. SABATH. I am willing that all of that should go in, but I would like to go over the article before it goes in.

Mr. BURNETT. Let it go into the printed record, and if any reply is desired, it can be made.

Mr. SABATH. Then let it go in. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will now stand adjourned.

(Thereupon, at 11.30 o'clock a. m., the committee adjourned.)

(Following is the statement filed by Mr. Weitzel:)

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in the first place, as a member of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics and its national vice-councilor, and chairman of the national legislative committee of the Daughters of America, I beg to correct an impression conveyed to this committee by certain persons who have not only appeared here, but who have been elsewhere, quite misrepresenting the principles, objects, aims, and purposes of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics.

According to page 472 of the printed hearings, a member of this committee states that he has been "reliably informed" that the Junior Order "is the same as the old bigoted A. P. A." and is "merely operating under a new name." Another Congressman charges the order (p. 365) with engaging in a "particular propaganda," and I take it that he had been informed by what he considered "reliable authority" also that the Junior Order was an anti-Catholic organization. And, no doubt, his information came from some such over-zealous church enthusiast as, for instance, the editor of the Morning Star, a Catholic weekly, who has several articles in his issue of April 23, 1910, from which I desire to quote a few lines. In one editorial, entitled "Catholics and the duty of the hour," everlastingly criticising President Roosevelt for the Vatican incident, there are, among others, the following sentences: "All this cry of anticlericals, Protestants, and Masonic orders of 'Down with the church,' 'Away with the Pope,' is bombast and nonsense. Knowing our strength, what have we to fear? See the strength of Free Masonry and anticlericals. Are we not more powerful than they? Cognizant that we are the heirs of all ages in truth and doctrine, and that ours is the only church founded by Jesus Christ, why should we hide our light under a bushel?" In another column reference is made to the Junior Order and Daughters of America, whose "avowed purpose" is editorially asserted to be "nothing else than a revival of the fierce war waged by the infamous A. P. A.'s some years ago against the Catholic Church."

There is no foundation in fact for such statements, and I am sure they do not represent either in the matter of Masonry, Protestantism, Roosevelt, or the Junior Order the sentiments and attitude by which the entire church would be judged.

Just as an instance and in order to show that such criticism is not general, and that the order is nonsectarian, I desire to call the committee's attention to the friendly feeling existing between and

courtesies exchanged between three conventions of Catholics, Juniors, and Daughters of America which happened to meet in Canton, Ohio, September, 1906.

The Junior Order is not an antireligionist society; it is no more anti-Catholic than the Knights of Pythias, Elks, Odd Fellows, or the American Federation of Labor for that matter, every one of which have members of the Catholic faith and favor the enactment of more restrictive immigration laws. The Junior Order is a patriotic, fraternal, benevolent, and beneficiary organization, dating back almost a century. It cares for its sick, buries its dead, looks after their widows and orphans, provides insurance, stands for compulsory education, believes in freedom of conscience and liberty of worship, advocates good naturalization laws and the judicious restriction of undesirable immigration. Its motto, "Virtue, liberty, and patriotism," appeals to the very highest sentiment and to the very best in man.

In 1905-6, through its national legislative committee, the order joined in the general demand for a correction of the scandalous naturalization frauds and immigration evils that were continually shocking the public conscience, and so forcibly called attention to by President Roosevelt, who recommended strongly the enactment of the illiteracy test, a money requirement, and other restrictive measures, and who said in one of his annual messages to Congress:

In the year ending June 30, 1905, there came to the United States 1,026,000 alien immigrants. Most of the undesirable class does not come here of its own initiative, but because of the activities of agents of transportation companies. These agents wheedle and cajole many immigrants, often against their own interests, to come here. The most serious obstacle we have to encounter in the effort to secure proper regulation of immigration to these shores arises from the detrimental opposition of foreign steamship lines, who have no interest whatever in the matter save to increase the returns on their capital by carrying masses of immigration hither in the steerage of their ships.

With the passage of a fairly good naturalization law and the enactment of an immigration law shutting out a few more of the very worst elements, and creating an investigating commission, the national council has not, as alleged before this committee, been carrying on any "particular propaganda" or engaged in any active campaign for the further restriction of immigration since that time; but in order not to be charged with leaving a wrong impression, I beg to say that this fall, with the final report of the commission assured, its national legislative committee will again respond to the wishes of the membership and try to assist in helping along the demand for such conservative and rational legislation as will, when once enacted, although bitterly opposed at the time of the demand, meet with the approval of practically every one of its opponents when the demanded legislation is once upon the statute books, just as all existing naturalization and immigration exclusion laws have been opposed at the time of their enactment only to later meet with approval.

The order is not opposed to all immigration at all. It is not opposed to foreigners already in this country at all, merely because they are foreign born; but stands not only for taking care of and lending a helping hand to the strangers within our gates, but also stands for immigration legislation that will protect them as much for legislation that will protect those that were born here; and principally because such legislation will tend to counteract the present profit-

making selection of our immigrants and the present artificial stimulation of immigration traffic, in which there is the most money for the foreign steamship companies. As to distribution as a remedy we would quote President Roosevelt to the effect that distribution is merely a palliative and not a cure. It is advocated chiefly by the transportation interests financially interested in the promotion of immigration and because distribution and diversion would make more room for them to unload more immigrants if successfully carried out. We do not at all favor restrictive legislation simply because southeast European and western Asiatic countries send us almost exclusively Catholics and Jews, but it is for purely patriotic and protective reasons that we advocate such additional selective restrictive measures as a \$25 to \$50 money test, such as Canada has, and such an illiteracy test as Cape Colony, New Zealand, and Australia have, which, together with our being made by the foreign steamships the cheapest country to reach, we believe to a large measure accounts for our being the only country with any considerable net foreign immigration.

Our desire for better immigration laws is not founded on any religious or other prejudice, foreign or native. That there are "immigration evils" demanding drastic action is a matter of official record. The first partial report of the Immigration Commission (H. Doc. 1489, 60th Cong.) states: "Many undeniably undesirable persons are admitted every year. There is a dangerous and apparently growing criminal element in the country due to immigration." And even says, "Many women are being regularly imported under conditions which amount to absolute slavery." etc.

It was Marcus Braun, a government inspector, who foreshadowed the commission's finding, and even discovered a secret contract between a foreign steamship company and a foreign government that provided for the dumping practically of so many thousand annually upon the United States, and who, according to House Document 384, Fifty-ninth Congress, reported officially of his foreign tour of inspection:

I found a condition of things which convinced me beyond any doubt that some European governments, agencies, and private individuals are continuing to regard this country as the dumping ground for thousands of their undesirable people. These conditions, coupled with the arrogant and widespread assumption that this country is but an asset of a large number of Europeans, subject only to their desires and orders, is such that if universally known in this country would drive the blood of humiliation into the face of every good American and a description of which would defy the pen of a Macaulay.

Certainly Marcus Braun, a foreign-born investigator, can not be charged with bigotry or nativist or religious bias and prejudice. Neither can such a charge be lodged successfully against Ambassador Andrew D. White, Commissioner Bingham, Commissioner William Williams, Doctor Darlington, Theodore Roosevelt, or the United States Bureau of Immigration whose words and expert opinions in the premises I beg to call to your attention.

Andrew D. White, our ambassador to Germany, wrote from Berlin April 19, 1905, to Mr. Josiah Flynt, as follows:

DEAR MR. FLYNT: AS you know, I consider the problems furnished by crime in the United States as of the most pressing importance. We are allowing a great and powerful criminal class to be developed, and while crime is held carefully in check in most European countries, and in them is steadily decreasing,

with us it is more and more flourishing. It increases from year to year and in various ways asserts its power in society.

So well is this coming to be known by criminal classes of Europe, that it is perfectly well understood here that they look upon the United States as a "happy hunting ground," and more and more seek it, to the detriment of our country and all that we hold most dear in it.

Yours, faithfully,

ANDREW D. WHITE.

In this connection I beg to say in passing that over one-fifth of all the alien felons now confined in our state and federal jails and prisons are illiterate, every one of whom and their offspring would have been excluded, as well as the Czolgosz family, by the illiteracy.

There are two extracts from a previous report of the present commissioner of immigration at Ellis Island, Hon. William Williams, who handles the bulk of the present alien influx of from about a million to almost a million and a half aliens annually, that I beg to read. In his report, as practically in last year's report, he said:

The laws do not reach a large body of immigrants who are generally undesirable, because unintelligent, of low vitality, of poor physique, able to perform only the cheapest kind of manual labor, desirous of locating almost exclusively in the cities, by their competition tending to reduce the standard of the wage-worker, and unfitted mentally or morally for good citizenship. I believe that at least 200,000 (and probably more) aliens came here who, although they may be able to earn a living, yet are not wanted, will be of no benefit to the country, and will, on the contrary, be a detriment, because their presence will tend to lower our standards. Their coming has been of benefit chiefly, if not only, to the transportation companies which brought them here.

Relying on the views generally expressed by the intelligent press throughout the country, on those expressed by nine out of ten citizens, whether native or foreign born, with whom one discusses the subject; on letters received from charitable and reformatory institutions in some eastern States, and upon official observation at Ellis Island, I would state without hesitation that the vast majority of American citizens wish to see steps taken to prevent these undesirable elements from landing on our shores. Attempts to take such steps will be opposed by powerful and selfish interests, and they will insist, among other things, on the value of immigration in the past and the enormous demand for labor, neither of them relevant as applicable to the particular question whether the undesirable immigrants shall be prevented from coming here. Europe, like every other part of the world, has millions of undesirable people whom she would be glad to part with, and strong agencies are constantly at work to send some of them here. Aliens have no inherent right whatever to come here, and we may and should take means, however radical and drastic, to keep out all below a certain physical and economic standard of fitness and all whose presence will tend to lower our standards of living and civilization.

Right in line with Commissioner Williams's opinion are the recommendations of the experts of the United States Immigration Bureau, as set forth in the last annual report (1909) of 244 pages. In the first place, we quite agree with what the bureau has to say on page 7 in regard to administration.

An ideal administration of the immigration law would prevent the entry of undesirable aliens to such an extent that the provisions contemplating expulsion would seldom need to be invoked. Such standard is, like all ideals, difficult of attainment; but it can be more nearly approximated than at present, provided the foregoing suggestions are adopted and the law is strengthened, rounded out, and completed. The bureau believes in a strict administration, not only because it is best calculated to protect the country against undesirable immigration, but because of its humanitarian advantages. A rigid enforcement of the law, in the final analysis, is the most humane. If it becomes thoroughly understood by all that only certain well-defined desirable classes will be permitted to land on our shores, other classes will hesitate to apply, and the transportation companies will refuse to bring them.

In this connection, I, would like to urge upon the committee the serious consideration also of carrying out previous recommendations of the bureau, to not only increase the fine upon steamships for bringing here dangerously diseased aliens, but to also extend it to the bringing here of any undesirable excluded by law, whose undesirability might have been ascertained at the time either of foreign embarkation or of purchase of ticket by a medical or other competent examination or investigation. It is a matter of common knowledge that the transportation interests pursue the course most profitable to them. Very few, if any of them make any genuine effort to turn back undesirables. It is more profitable for them to occasionally pay the present fine and to deport those excluded than to reject them as the law requires at the foreign ports and thus save the hardships of deportation. Mr. Burnett, a member of this committee and a member of the commission, found the examination at Queenstown to be a farce—not to be an examination at all, I have been reliably informed. And only a month ago Commissioner Williams at Ellis Island issued another circular letter calling attention to the “wholly inadequate attention” paid abroad to and respect for our exclusion laws.

On page 111 and following the bureau calls attention to the sources of and inducements to immigration, pointing out how not only the quantity has increased recently, but the quality has changed, the number of deficient, dependents, and delinquents having increased by leaps and bounds, and resulted in Congress passing a series of acts excluding various classes, and thus entering upon a restrictive policy toward European immigration.

Among other things the report says:

The bureau has repeatedly called attention to the interesting and important economic problem constituted by this increase in the influx of peoples so different racially from the original settlers of the country—peoples who, in their antecedents, ideas (political and social), and methods of life and thought, are quite distinct from the Teutonic and Celtic stocks, from which our immigration was for so many years derived. What will be the result of a continuance of this preponderance is a question which concerns every thoughtful patriotic American citizen. From our point of view, at least, heterogeneousness in a matter of this kind is undesirable, homogeneousness desirable. There can be but little homogeneity between the people of southern and eastern Europe and the real American.

The “explanation” for this enormous changed alien influx from countries of western Asia and eastern Europe is simply that “the peasants of the countries mentioned have supplied a rich harvest to the promoter of immigration”—the “steamship ticket agent.” His interest is the wholly selfish one of gaining his commission and collecting his usury. He is employed by the steamship lines, large and small, without scruple, and to the enormous profit of such lines. To say that the steamship lines are responsible, directly or indirectly, for this unnatural immigration is not a statement of a theory but of a fact, and of a fact that sometimes becomes, indeed, if it is not always, a crying shame. It has been proven to at least a moral certainty by statements that have been made to the bureau by its agents detailed abroad in past years, some of which have been quoted in previous reports. It has been demonstrated in both a moral and a legal sense by a report and accompanying documentary evidence submitted to the bureau during the past year by Contract Labor Inspector John

Gruenberg, who spent several months in Europe and in this country in the conduct of a quiet but deep investigation covering the entire field of "artificially induced immigration."

The bureau is very clear in its attitude toward legislation. It says, page 5, "the bureau believes that the time has come for the adoption of some measures more restrictive," and has this to say about the literacy test and an increased head tax:

There is considerable merit in each proposal; but do either or even both of them constitute a test sufficiently high or exacting to reach the said class above mentioned? If either a literacy test or an increased head tax, or the two combined, will partly effect that object, the adoption of such a measure obviously would be advisable.

Among the recommendations of the bureau, as set forth in its last annual report, are also the following:

Persons economically undesirable: all male aliens between the ages of 16 and 50 unable to stand the army recruiting test, because they are admitted to a share in our institutions and ought to be able to defend them if occasion should require.

These and other recommendations such as a new immigration act of 50 sections, to be found on pages 153 to 174 of the report, are to be found in H. R. 21588, introduced by Congressman Elvins, which, as well as H. R. 13404, introduced by Congressman Hayes, meet with great favor with not only the Junior Order and Daughters of America, but also the Hamilton County immigration bureau of Ohio, and would remedy, in our opinion, the conditions even called attention to by such a distinguished poet as Thomas Bailey Aldrich, of Boston, with which I beg to conclude, thanking you for the privilege and honor of being heard upon this important question:

UNGUARDED GATES.

Wide open and unguarded stand our gates,
And through them press a wild, a motley throng—
Men from the Volga and the Tartar steppes,
Featureless figures of the Hoang-Ho,
Malayan, Scythian, Teuton, Kelt, and Slav.
Flying the Old World's poverty and scorn:
These bringing with them unknown gods and rites,
Those tiger passions, here to stretch their claws,
In street and alley what strange tongues are these,
Accents of menace alien to our air,
Voices that once the tower of Babel knew!
O, Liberty, white goddess, is it well
To leave the gate unguarded? On thy breast
Fold sorrow's children, soothe the hurts of fate,
Lift the downtrodden, but with the hand of steel
Stay those who to thy sacred portals come
To waste the gift of freedom. Have a care
Lest from thy brow the clustered stars be torn
And trampled in the dust. For so of old
The thronging Goth and Vandal trampled Rome,
And where the temples of the Cæsars stood
The lean wolf unmolested made her lair.

HEARING ON IMMIGRATION BILLS.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

STATEMENT BY THE HON. HENRY M. GOLDFOGLE, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM NEW YORK.

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization met on March 15, 1910, with the following-named Representatives in attendance: Howell, Bennet, Burnett, Edwards, Gardner, Goldfogle, Hayes, Johnson, Küstermann, Moore, of Pennsylvania, Moore, of Texas, and Sabath. Mr. Howell, the chairman, presided.

Representative Henry M. Goldfogle, of New York, made the following statement:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my views on the Hayes and Elvins bills pending in this committee, and on the proposition submitted by Mr. Gardner, are so well understood that I feel certain that I need not repeat them again at length. I desire once again, however, distinctly and emphatically to voice my opposition to these measures. There is no good reason to increase the head tax. The Government is now in receipt of more money from the head tax than is required to pay the entire expenses incident to carrying out the immigration laws and the maintenance of the Immigration Service. The argument is sometimes advanced that an increased head tax will tend to promote a better quality of immigrants. This argument is without merit. The real purpose of those who want the head tax increased is to make immigration more difficult and to greatly restrict it. The burden of the additional tax falls upon the immigrant and not upon the steamship companies, for when the companies will be required to pay an additional tax they will add it on to the fare of the immigrant. So that the proposed increase, from a financial standpoint, is unnecessary, and from other standpoints is as unwise as it is without reason.

I am opposed to the proposed educational test. Some of the best citizens of this country, when they came here from abroad, were illiterate; their knowledge of reading and writing was acquired in our schools or through means of private instructions. On the other hand, some very bad and vicious men who unfortunately got among us—some of our criminal classes, in fact—could read and write when they came to this country; indeed, some were well educated when they landed. Such as these would have no difficulty in coming into the country under an educational test. That such a test will neither keep out the bad nor the viciously inclined has been demonstrated over and over again. The fact is proven by figures which appear in some of the

statements made at the hearings thus far before this committee. I would not, nor is it right that I, a member of the committee, should burden this record with an unnecessary repetition of these figures, and hence I refrain from citing them again.

In New York City, the largest port of entry in this country, numberless thousands of immigrants who when they landed were illiterate eagerly sought our schools to obtain an elementary education. The workers and the toilers who were so situated that they could not go to the day schools attended night schools. The classes are crowded with immigrant scholars who rapidly acquire a knowledge of the English and make remarkable progress in their studies. The children of the immigrant classes, as well in day as in evening schools, exhibit remarkable aptitude for study. Though some come to us illiterate, they quickly acquire a knowledge of the English. I speak by the record and challenge contradiction when I say the young immigrants, these children of immigrant parents, are among the brightest pupils in our schools.

The arguments advanced by the restrictionists are the same old ones that have been made from time to time ever since the foundation of the Government. In the early part of our country's history it was prophesied by some of the statesmen of those days that the country would go to ruin if immigration was encouraged or further immigration permitted. At later stages the American Congress was warned that the influx of immigration was a menace to the nation. In various forms of expressions the alarm was sounded against immigration and the charge made that immigration was highly detrimental to the best interests of the country. We have lived to see these prophesies vanish like thin air. These fanciful theories, born of narrowness, of provincialism, and of prejudice, have been exploded. Through the immigration that has come in from year to year, the country has grown greater, wealthier, stronger, and more progressive, until now it is a nation of over ninety million people with marvelously developed resources and a world power.

In the work of the remarkable development of the entire country the foreign element and the naturalized citizen has done fully his share and fully contributed his quota. Immigration has aided, in a great measure and to a great extent, to build up and develop the entire country. The fusion and the intermingling of the different nationalities, represented in our population, have contributed to make us the great, the prosperous, and the progressive nation we are to-day. Through their thrift, their industry, their toil, and their energy the immigrant classes have helped to add to our nation's wealth and promote our national prosperity. Our country needs these men of brawn and of muscle. It requires the hardy workers on its roads, in its factories, in its mines, and in the hundred and one occupations where hard manual labor is required.

Remember, also, that the American farmer boy no longer contents himself with life upon the farm. He seeks the opportunities which city life affords. He longs for the pleasures of large towns and cities. As quickly as he can abandon the rural life he has led he leaves the occupation of the field, I regret to say, and takes up what to him seems more attractive, more remunerative, and more alluring in the city.

Many of the farms near to large towns and cities have been abandoned by the natives. The work of the field and in the forest had to be done by immigrants who settle in country districts, for they go there anxious for work and eager to earn a living through honest toil. The native American, and the educated immigrant, too, will not, unless driven by extremity, take up the work of the shovel, the sledge, and the pickax. The laborious work at the blazing furnace and at the forge, in the construction of railroads, such as leveling the roads, laying the rails, breaking stone, and tunneling mountains, and the work of digging the mines, and a score of similar pursuits that the common laborer follows, must, as a rule, be done by the immigrant classes. When this kind of labor is needed, what reasonable, sensible, rational man asks whether the laborer who is called upon to do it is literate or illiterate?

But it must be said, too, of these laborers and toilers, and it stands to their credit, that wherever they have gone they have sought the opportunities which our American communities offer for education. They quickly learn the English, learn to read and write, and they encourage their children to take the advantages which our schools everywhere hold out to them.

Immigration has aided to an immeasurable and enormous extent to open up the undeveloped sections of our country, and without going into the details, which will readily occur to our minds as we look over the great development of the Union and contemplate its variety of resources and its built-up areas north, east, south, and west, we all know that America would never be the great, prosperous nation that she is were it not for the immigration that has come to our shores.

I regret that so many restrictionists have in public (more frequently in private) expressed themselves against Russian, Roumanian, Gallician, Polish, Slavonian, Italian, and Hungarian immigration. I represent, in part, the city of New York. I passed my entire life there. My very intimate knowledge of the immigrant classes of these nationalities and the foreign-born population of New York qualifies me to speak of them. It is true that many of them came here penniless and that many came here also illiterate. The door of opportunity was closed to many of these people in their native land. They existed under conditions that deprived them of school opportunities. But, literate or illiterate, penniless or possessed of small means, they all enter into the spirit of American life. They have not abused the hospitality of the land. They have been law-abiding. They live by honest toil. They seek and follow employment in the hundred and one different industries. Many of them—thousands and thousands of them—have prospered, and from the humblest beginnings have become tradesmen, storekeepers, merchants, and business men in every avenue of commercial and industrial pursuit. Many of them—more, indeed, than anyone, in fact, imagines—have gone into the farming districts and entered upon agricultural pursuits. They have entered the shops and the factories and make good mechanics. Yet when many of them first landed they had little or no education, and some of them were illiterate and they could not have passed the educational tests that the bills before us contemplate. What a folly it would have been—nay, what a detriment to the country it would have been—if these helpful, useful, splendid men and women who have, each in their own way, by dint of labor and honest toil, contributed to the welfare of the land,

had been excluded because they could not read or write to satisfy an educational test.

The immigrant classes, the foreign born of whom I have spoken, were anxious for citizenship. When they became such, they performed their duties as well as other American citizens. They have made good American citizens. They have proven themselves worthy of the citizenship which they prize as a precious boon. They have learned to prize American citizenship because its cardinal duty is love of human freedom, and the corner stone of the Government that confers it is civil and religious liberty. They have manifested in a hundred and one ways their love of our American institutions. Their patriotism has been as intense as that of the native American. They are loyal to our country. They are devoted to the flag. They have been thrifty, and the wealth of our savings banks and the names of their depositors all testify to that fact. They have always exhibited an anxiety to work, to improve the condition of their families, and take care of their dependents. Wherever these men have settled values of real estate have risen, and in the grand sum total the wealth of the State and the nation has been increased.

Oh, these foreign born, with a keen appreciation of America's aims, her ideals, and her mission, have served this country in the darkest hours of our country's need! On the field of battle these foreign born have proven themselves heroes of undaunted courage. When the clash of arms came and men were called to fight for the honor and integrity of the American flag, these men of foreign birth, these men who were immigrants—some of whom were illiterate when they landed on our shores—went to the front and exemplified their patriotism for America and their love for the land of their adoption.

Reference was made in these hearings to the east side of New York. I tell you the immigrants who have come there—mainly Jewish, Russian, Roumanian, Gallician, Austrian, Hungarian, German, and Italian—have made desirable acquisitions to our great city. They are toilers and not idlers. Their men are industrious and their women virtuous. They live "in the sweat of their brow." There are no more thrifty and industrious people anywhere in the world than these men and women. They abide within the law. Crime with them is rare. They are home builders. They love their families. The older people exhibit keen anxiety for the education of their children. Those who can only read the Yiddish read with keen interest and with great intelligence the papers that are published over there on the east side in the Yiddish. These Yiddish newspapers are well edited. They convey to the foreigners as fully and as well as the English newspapers do the news of the day. They contain excellent reading matter, which tends not only to the enlightenment of their readers, but to their Americanization. These papers, published in the Yiddish, having a large circulation among the immigrant classes over there, are powerful factors to enlighten, to educate, and to Americanize. They have instilled into the minds of these foreign born a deeper appreciation of the benefits and advantages that America holds out to them.

The schools over there are filled with children of the immigrants. Some of these children were born here. Some were born over on the other side of the Atlantic. Many of those who came from the other side of the Atlantic were illiterate. But these children learn with a rapidity that is simply remarkable, and does them great credit. They

are thirsty for knowledge. They learn quickly. Their teachers speak highly of them. Step by step their ambition runs higher and higher as they grow older. My heart thrills with joy when I go, as I frequently do, to witness the exercises in these schools and note the remarkable progress of these foreign-born children—these children of the people who have come from the lands of oppression and tyranny—and observe how intense is their patriotism for the American flag.

It would, indeed, be a great lesson to those who constantly preach restriction of immigration if they would spend some time in our great cities and go into the different institutions that have been established for the care and the welfare and the betterment and the education of the immigrant classes. These institutions are many. The libraries are filled with the immigrant classes to which I have referred. Their love for knowledge and their desire for education are greater than most men have any idea. Institutions of every kind, made up in their membership in a great measure of men of foreign birth, will be found not only in my city, but in the other large cities of this Union, for the care, for the welfare, for the education, and for the Americanization of the immigrant classes. I could use up an hour in detailing the names of these varied, well-managed institutions, and the splendid fraternal orders, and the benevolent organizations that have done so much toward the uplift, toward the betterment, toward the educational advancement, and the Americanization of the foreign born who have made our country their home. I refrain from taxing your patience or from burdening this record with these details, and I fear were I to make mention of these splendidly maintained institutions, these fraternal orders, these benevolent and charitable organizations, I might do some injustice by unintentional omission.

Surely you will not wonder that many of the immigrants, to which we have mainly had reference in these hearings, may not be able to pass an educational test. The Jewish immigrant, the Russian, the Roumanian, and the Gallician, as well as some of the others I have mentioned, come from where oppression and tyranny exist. They lived under intolerable conditions. They were the subjects of persecution and of religious bigotry and hatred. They fled from the rule of despotism and from scenes of cruelty. They were proscribed in their native lands. They were denied the equal protection of the law in their lands. They were maltreated and, without rhyme or reason, downtrodden, and by the fanatics were despised. Do you wonder then if they lack the learning that the educational tests proposed by the bills would require. But these men and women once breathing the air of American liberty, quickly enter into the spirit of American life. They value our American institutions. They prove themselves grateful to America for the blessings that they here enjoy.

I oppose, with all the power I am capable of possessing, the proposed requirement in one of the bills before this committee that every alien in the United States within one year from the passage of the bill take out a certificate of residence containing a description and photograph of himself under penalty of deportation. Such a provision is absurd. It is un-American. It is opposed to the teachings of the fathers who founded this Republic. It is opposed to the genius of our American institutions. It speaks and it breathes the spirit of European despotism. It teaches a deep-rooted prejudice against the foreign born. It is a revival of the know-nothing spirit. Its effect is to

treat the unnaturalized alien as we would the criminal classes. It places him under a surveillance more closely than the surveillance which is founded under the Russian system in despotic Russia. It is intended to create a condition to restrict, if not in a great measure to prevent, immigration. Think of the policy of exile it would create. I dismiss the subject because I cannot believe that, imbued with the spirit of Americanism, you can ever get an American Congress, so long as we shall revere the teachings of the fathers of the Constitution, so long as we shall cherish American liberty, to pass such harsh, unnecessary and absurd provisions.

I have only in a general way presented my views against these proposed restrictive measures. I avoid now again entering into details.

Sufficient has been supplied to this committee, both in the hearings and by myself and some of my colleagues, in our talks and conferences amongst us on the subject, that it becomes unnecessary for me to add to the figures and details with which we are all so familiar.

My opposition to the measures comes from no selfish motive. I do not speak from partiality for or favoritism to any class. I speak from the standpoint of a broad and liberal American, looking to the interests of my country and hoping for an ever increasing prosperity of our nation.

The present immigration laws, when properly enforced, are reasonably sufficient to safeguard the country against the admission of undesirable people.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that these propositions will be rejected by the committee and voted down.

(The committee thereupon went into executive session.)

INDEX.

A.

	Page.
Adler, Cyrus, request to appear before committee	126
Allevi, Luigi, reference to, by Mrs. Quackenbos	421-423
Andrews, W. F., statement of	96
Anderson, T. J., Topeka, Kans., letter of	173
Avery, N. P., Chamber of Commerce, Holyoke, Mass., letter of	178

B.

Bennet, Hon. Wm. S., statement of	259-476
Burnett, Hon. John L.:	
Statement of	383-414
Reference to, by Mr. Brooks	221
Bennett, S. W., Jr. O. U. A. M. of Ohio, resolutions	90
Berg, G. H., Nordsjerman, foreign paper delegation	128
Behar, N., National Liberal Immigration League	128
Berlin, H., Federation of Jewish Organizations, New York	128
Berko, G. D., Amerika, Magyar Nepszva	128
Beard, M. R., Sacramento, Cal., letter from	158
Bentley, C. H., San Francisco, Cal., letter from	159
Beardsley, H. M., mayor of Kansas City, letter from	185
Bell, James A., Harrisburg, Pa., letter from	202
Beck, labor commissioner, Wisconsin, letter from	216
Benham, Wm. R., reference to, by Mrs. Quackenbos	439
Boggs, J. T., Farmers' Union of South Carolina	90
Briggs, Walter J., Austria, foreign newspaper men	128
Brown, Geo. R., Board of Trade, Little Rock, Ark., letter from	150
Brockway, Z. R., mayor of Elmira, N. Y., letter from	191
Brooks, B. B., governor of Wyoming, letter from	216
Brooks, T. J., Farmers' Union, statement of	217
Broad, John H., State School of Agriculture, New York	382
Brown, Martin B., reference to, by Mrs. Quackenbos	423
Broad, J. H., letter of Representative Sabbath	471
Braun, Marcus, special inspector, reference to	504-
Bingham, Theo. A., police commissioner, reference to	403
Blye, H. C., reference to, by Mrs. Quackenbos	423
Burke, John, governor of North Dakota, letter from	198
Butcher, Henry A., Denver, Colo., letter from	160

C.

Cable, Benj. S.:	
Statement of	96
Letter relative to head tax	132-133
Campbell, Richard K.:	
Statement relative to naturalization	23-30
Statement regarding educational test	70
Capparucci, A., Opinione, foreign newspaper delegation	128
Cavanaugh, John, letter from	280
Caughy, Charles M., American consul, reference to, by Mr. Burnett	389
Chamberlain, Geo. E., Salem, Oreg., letter from	202
Chamberlain, E. T., Commissioner of Navigation, regarding seamen	144
Chamberlain, I. D., Knights of Labor	95
Clark, Aaron, former mayor of New York City, letter to	328-369
Clay, Henry, reference to, by Mr. Keliher	369

	Page.
Clark, H. C., Syracuse, letter from	197
Clute, J. W., mayor, Schenectady, N. Y., letter from	196
Clyde, George A., Rome, N. Y., letter from	195
Collins, C. V., statement regarding alien criminals	41
Comer, B. B., governor of Alabama, letter from	154
Cox, Wm. H., Maysville, Ky., letter from	174
Crocker, J. F., Chamber of Commerce, Boston, letter from	177
Crawford, C. I., governor of South Dakota, letter from	208
Cummins, A. B., governor of Iowa, letter from	172
Cutler, Harry, Providence, R. I., statement of	360-364
Cutler, Jno. C., governor of Utah, letter from	211

D.

Darlington, Thos., reference to, by Mr. Burnett	400
Davis, Brig. Gen. Geo. B., statement of, relative to naturalization	11-17
Deneen, C. S., governor of Illinois, letters from	378-379
Dickey, J. T., Farmers' Union of Georgia	87
Dupree, G. D., Farmers' Union of Louisiana	94

E.

Earl, Charles, Department of Commerce and Labor:	
Statement of	105
Letter about aliens from Mexico	136-139
Earl, J. C.:	
Bowery Mission, reference to	251
Western jobs for immigrants	257
Eliot, C. W., letter from, on immigration	280
Elkus, Abram I., statement of	339-348

F.

Fay, T., Houston and Texas Railroad, letter from	209
Farmer, L. P., reference to by Mrs. Quackenbos	423
Felton, S. M., Chicago, Ill., letter from	167
Ferris, A. W., reference to by Mr. Brooks	220
Fitch, W. F., Marquette, Mich., letter from	179
Flickinger, S. J., secretary to governor of Ohio, letter from	199
Fluhart, Theo., Chamber of Commerce, Dayton, Ohio, letter from	201
Flynt, Josiah, letter to, from Andrew D. White	504
Finley, W. W., reference to by Mr. Burnett	405
Folk, Jos. W., governor of Missouri, letter from	185
Fowler, T. P., New York, letter from	194
Frick, A. W., Nebraska labor board, letter from	257
Frugone, F. L., Bolletino della Sera, foreign newspaper delegation	128

G.

Goldfogle, Hon. H. M., statement of, separation of families	56-61, 508-513
Gasson, T. I., letter from	281
Garvin, Thos. H., clerk house of representatives, Pennsylvania, resolutions adopted	86
Gendel, Paul, 15-year old immigrant, letter from	297
Greenfield, Martin, reference to, by Mrs. Quackenbos	433
Gruenberg, John:	
Reference to, by Mr. Burnett	396-397
Report of, relative to immigration	506
Griffith, W. G., New York, statement of	66-68
Grella, E. M., Girnale Italiano, foreign newspaper delegation	128
Gooding, T. R., Boise, Idaho, letter from	166
Gnitchell, F. W., mayor, Trenton, N. J., letter from	189

H.

Hayes, Hon. E. A.:	
Extract from speech, statement of T. J. Brooks	238
Reference to speech he made, T. J. Brooks	242

	Page.
Hayes, J. W., Knights of Labor, reference to by T. J. Brooks	219
Hayes, John W., resolutions of Knights of Labor	95
Haas, A. J., Cleveland, Ohio, clerk of naturalization court	11
Haynes, J. C., mayor, Minneapolis, Minn., letter from	181
Harrison, F. B., statement of	375-378
Hall, Prescott F.:	
Author, reference to by Mr. Burnett	395
Quotation from his book	69
Hanson, J. F., Macon, Ga., letter from	165
Harris, George B., Chicago, Ill., letter from	167
Harahan, J. T., Chicago, Ill., letter from	171
Hausssling, Jacob, mayor, Newark, N. J., letter from	188
Hammerling, L. N., president Foreign Editors' Association	128
Hanauer, A. M., Pittsburg, Pa., letter from	205
Halpern, Morris, N. Y., cousin of alien	358
Herbruck, C. G., Jr. O. U. A. M. Ohio, resolutions	90
Heller, Isaac, Boston, Mass., telegram to Hon. J. F. O'Connell	303
Hill, James J.:	
Reference to, by Hon. J. L. Burnett	412
Reference to, by Mrs. Quackenbos	449
St. Paul, Minn., letter from	183
St. Paul, Minn., newspaper clipping reference	239
Himmell, Joseph, Georgetown University, letter from	281
Hirsh, Baron, farming colony in New Jersey, reference to	269
Higgins, James H., governor, Rhode Island, letter from	205
Holder, A. E., American Federation of Labor, statement of	111
Hoch, E. W., governor of Kansas, letter from	173
Howell, Hon. Benj. F., letter from John J. D. Trenor	150
Howland, Hon. Paul, statement relative to naturalization	1-11
Hudson, H. P., Farmers' Alliance, Tennessee	87

J.

Jackson, M. G., Farmers' Union, Texas	87
Johnson, Tom. L., Cleveland, Ohio, letter from	200
Johnson, L. E., Norfolk and Western Railroad, letter from	215
Johnson, John F., governor, Minnesota, letter from	181
Jones, W. B., Chamber of Commerce, Albany, N. Y., letter from	189
Judson, H. P., University of Chicago, letter from	280
Julin, Charles, executive secretary Connecticut, letter from	161

K.

Keliher, Hon. J. A.:	
Statement of	365-375
Statement of, naturalization certificates	374
Kamaiky, L., Jewish Daily News, foreign newspaper delegation	128
Kavanaugh, W. M., Little Rock, Ark., letter from	158
Keefe, D. J., Commissioner General, reference to by Hon. J. L. Burnett	396-398
Kite, E. W., Jr. O. U. A. M. of Ohio, resolutions	90
Killen, W. H., labor commissioner, Wisconsin, letter from	216
Kohler, Max J., New York, statement of	348-360
Kozma, Dr. A., Szabadsag, foreign newspaper delegation	128
Krauskopf, Reverend Doctor, Jewish school in Pennsylvania	269

L.

Latimer, Hon. A. C., reference to by Hon. J. L. Burnett	271
Lafean, E. C., National Council Junior Order United American Mechanics	489
Lauchheimer, Col. Chas. H., U. S. Marine Corps, naturalization statement	23
Le Lanne, Frank D., president National Board of Trade, letters	150-151
Lichtliter, Rev. M. D., of Pennsylvania, statement of	489
Lucacin, Dr. E. L., Romanul in America, foreign newspaper delegation	128
Lupton, George F., San Antonio, Tex., letter from	209
Lyons, Pat. J., mayor of Mobile, Ala., letter from	155
Lyons, Thomas J., labor board, Maine, letter from	175
Lynch, E. J., labor board, Minnesota, letter from	182

M.

	Page.
Mack, Julian, Chicago, Ill., letter from.....	379
Marks, Joe, Russian tailor, reference to by Mrs. Quackenbos.....	420
Mann, Elias P., mayor, Troy, N. Y., letter from.....	197
Marshall, Louis, New York, statement of.....	305-332
Maupin, W. M., Nebraska, letter from.....	257
MacPherran, E. W., land commissioner, Michigan, letter from.....	180
McKinley, William (President), reference to, by Hon. J. L. Burnett.....	401
McHarg, Ormsby, former Assistant Secretary Commerce and Labor, letter of.....	488
Mitchell, John:	
Quotation from statement of, by J. H. Patten.....	82-83
Reference to, by Hon. John L. Burnett.....	404
McClinton, M. G., National Council, Jr. O. U. A. M.....	93
McCarthy, Carlton, mayor of Richmond, Va., letter from.....	243
Miller, L. E., Jewish Daily Warheit.....	128
Milner, R. F., Texas agricultural department, letter from.....	208
Mooney, G. W., speaker of Ohio house, resolutions adopted.....	85
Morkezel, N. A., in Al-Hoda, foreign newspaper delegation.....	128
Mobile, Ala., Chamber of Commerce, resolutions.....	155
Morris, T. O., mayor of Nashville, Tenn., letter from.....	208
Morse, S. F. B., extract from paper by.....	327

N.

Nagel, Charles, Secretary Commerce and Labor, reference to, by T. J. Brooks.....	218
Nelson, O. O., Montgomery, Ala., letter from.....	156
Norton, Charles D., statement regarding head-tax receipts.....	131
Noyes, John N., member National Council Jr. O. U. A. M.....	489
Nye, W. G., Minneapolis, Minn., letter from.....	182

O.

Overman, Hon. Lee S., speech of, at New York.....	42-45
Orbach, Rev. C. L., Slovak v Amerike.....	128
Otis, Harrison G., reference to, by Hon. J. A. Keliher.....	368
Oliver, Gulda, immigrant excluded.....	358

P.

Page, Louis F., Brooklyn, N. Y., letter from.....	67
Parrott, S. F., Macon, Ga., letter from.....	164
Parsons, Hon. Herbert, statement of, moral turpitude.....	61-65
Patten, J. H., secretary National Immigration Restriction League, statement of.....	31-68
Patten, J. H., statement of.....	68-95
Patton, K. S., vice-consul at Rome, Italy, affidavit.....	426-431
Pennington, E., Minneapolis, Minn., letter from.....	184
Piptore, Thos., Italian magazine.....	128
Pope, J. W., Atlanta, Ga., letter from.....	163
Potter, Right Rev. Henry C., bishop, New York, letter from.....	192
Powderly, T. V.:	
Reference to, by T. J. Brooks.....	240
Letter to, by Mrs. Mary G. Quackenbos.....	417-418
Reference to, by Mrs. Quackenbos.....	443
Report of.....	460-463
Planches, E. Mayor, Italian ambassador, letter of.....	488
Pumpelly, J. C., New York, letter of.....	380-381

Q.

Quackenbos, Mrs. Mary Grace, statement of.....	415-467
Quinlan, James, New York, letter from.....	192

R.

Raymond, A. V., Schenectady, N. Y., letter from.....	196
Read, Albert M., National Board of Trade, Washington, D. C., letter from....	151
Rea, Samuel, Pennsylvania Railroad, Philadelphia, letter from.....	204

	Page.
Reynolds, James B.:	
Treatment of immigrants	37-40
Report on Ellis Island, New York	52-53
Reference to, by Hon. William S. Bennet	76
Reynaudi, L., commissioner general, Rome, letter of	488
Reilly, James M., secretary Board of Trade, Newark, N. J., letter of	188
Rhett, R. G., mayor Charleston, S. C., letter of	206
Ripley, E. P., Chicago, Ill., letter from	168
Roe, A. A., Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, statement of	235-243
Ross, David, secretary bureau of labor, Illinois, letter from	172
Robinson, L. R., New York City, peonage case	433
Roosevelt, Theodore, quotation from message, Hon. J. L. Burnett. 401-462, 497, 498, 503	
Russell, W. T., Baltimore, Md., letter from	176

S.

Sabath, Hon. A. J., statement of	467
Sargent, F. P.:	
Commissioner-General, report of	460
Quotation from statement regarding educational qualifications	69-70
Salvatore, Grannaugeli, reference to by Mrs. Quackenbos	425
Sanders, Leon, of New York, statement of	337-339
Schwab, G. H., of North German Lloyd, statement before Industrial Commission	31
Schwald, R.:	
State Council Jr. O. U. A. M., Ohio	90
Member National Council Jr. O. U. A. M.	489
Schuler, Charles, commissioner of labor, Louisiana	175
Schurman, J. G., Ithaca, N. Y., letter from	281
Schwartz, S. S., New York, reference to by Mrs. Quackenbos	442
Sebastian, Jno., Chicago, Ill., letter from	170
Seperstein, Jewish Morning Journal	128
Sevier, L., Norfolk, Va., letter from	213
Sheldon, F. B., Columbus, Ohio, letter from	200
Solean, W. L.:	
Disbursing agent, Department of Commerce and Labor, statement of	96
Tables showing head tax	133
Scott, Thos. K., Augusta, Ga., letter from	164
Sheldon, Geo. L., governor of Nebraska, letter from	186
Smith, Hoke, Georgia, reference to by T. J. Brooks	227
Strauss, Osear:	
Former Secretary Commerce and Labor, reference to	239
Relative to new irrigation law	36
Steadwell, B. B., La Crosse, Wis., reference to by J. H. Patten	33
Stiekney, A. B., St. Paul, Minn., letter from	184
Stocking, William, Chamber of Commerce, Detroit, Mich., letter from	178
Stokes, Edward C., governor of New Jersey, letter from	187
Stevens, Geo. W., Richmond, Va., letter from	214
Sulzer, Hon. William, statement relative to separation of families	53-55
Sulzberger, C. S., of New York, statement of	282-305
Svarc, Ven, of Cleveland, Ohio, statement of	333-337

T.

Taft, William H., reference to, by T. J. Brooks	220
Taylor, Jesse:	
Jr. O. U. A. M. of Ohio	90
National Council Jr. O. U. A. M.	93
J. P. Thompson, Boston, Mass., quotation from his work	329
Thompson, C. A., secretary of state, Ohio, resolutions of legislature	85
Treadway, F. W., president Ohio senate, resolutions of	85
Trenor, John J. D., New York:	
National Board of Trade	150
Letter of inquiry on immigration	152
Index to letters received	153-154
Letter of	382

	Page.
Truesdale, W. H., New York, Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad, letter from	191
Tuttle, Lucius, Boston, Boston and Maine Railroad, letter from	177

U.

Underwood, F. P., New York, letter from	194
---	-----

V.

Valgevec, V. J., Glas Navoda, foreign newspaper delegation	128
Van Asmus, H. D. C., Grand Rapids, Mich., letter from	179
Van Deman, Esther B., affidavit of, regarding labor agents in Italy	426-431
Vicario, Jno., Avaldo Italiano, foreign newspaper delegation	128
Vlasto, S. J., editor Atlantis, reference to, by Mrs. Quackenbos	439

W.

Watson, E. J., labor commissioner, South Carolina, letter from	207
Watson, J. B., Farmers' Union, South Carolina	90
Watchorn, Robert, New York:	
Crippled alien admitted	57
Reference to administration of office	38
Watson, E. J., South Carolina, reference to, by T. J. Brooks	226
Wazeter, L. F., Tygodnik Polski, foreign newspaper delegation	128
Williams, William, New York:	
Reference to, succeeding Robert Watchorn	37-52
Indorsement of his administration	67
Reference to his work as commissioner	76
Reference to, by T. J. Brooks	219
Quotation from New York Tribune	239
Report of, on immigration, etc	505
Weitzel, John J., Cincinnati:	
Jr. O. U. A. M., Ohio	94
National Council Jr. O. U. A. M.	489-501
Wiley, H. A., lieutenant commander, statement regarding naturalization	17
Williams, J. W., clerk house of delegates, Virginia	36
Williams, Arthur, Denver, Colo., letter from	160
Webb, Wesley, state board of agriculture, Dover, Del.	162
Werwinski, Jos. A., Gonico Polski, foreign newspaper delegation	128
Wickersham, George W., Attorney-General, approving letter of Charles Earl ..	139
Wilson, Horace, mayor of Wilmington, Del., letter from	162
Williamson, W. W., Savannah, Ga., letter from	165
Wilgus, S. D., New York, reference to, by T. J. Brooks	220
Whitlock, Brand, mayor, Toledo, Ohio, letter from	201
White, Andrew D., ambassador to Germany, letter from	505
Wheeler, W. R., San Francisco, Cal., letter from	488
Woods, M. M., National Council Jr. O. U. A. M.	93
Wolf, Simon, Washington, D. C.:	
Request for hearing	126
Statement of	274-279

RESOLUTIONS.

American Federation of Labor:	
Convention at Pittsburg	112
Convention at Minneapolis	112
Convention at Denver	113
Convention at Toronto	113
Resolutions relative to musicians	120
Quotation from proceedings at convention, November, 1909	84
Alabama immigration conference, June, 1905	226
American Association of Foreign Language Newspapers, resolutions	127-128
Assembly of State of Ohio	85
American Purity League, Burlington, Iowa	95

	Page.
Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen:	
Convention at Buffalo, N. Y	95
Convention at Columbus, Ohio	243
Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union	86, 87-89
Farmers' Union of Louisiana	94
Farmers' National Union of Memphis, Tenn.:	
Resolution No. 1	114
Resolution No. 2	115
Farmers' National Union, convention at Birmingham, Ala	218
General Assembly, Knights of Labor, convention November 9, 1908	95
Georgia Federation of Labor	92
Immigration convention, Tampa, Fla	88
League of Republican Clubs, Syracuse, N. Y	382
Native American National Convention:	
Philadelphia, July 4, 1845	328
New York, June, 1837	328
National Council Junior Order United American Mechanics	88-93
Ohio legislature, March, 1909	489
Patriotic Sons of America, of Pennsylvania	95
Senate of State of Virginia	86-225
State Council Jr. O. U. A. M.:	
Ohio	90-94
Maryland	91
State Camp, P. O. S. of A., Pennsylvania	91
State Council Jr. O. U. A. M., New York	66

HEAD TAX.

American Association of Foreign Newspapers	127-129
Bennet, Hon. Wm. S., statement of	70-75
Burnett, Hon. John L., statement of	384-414
Cable, Benj. S., Commerce and Labor, statement of	96-111
Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, Birmingham, Ala	218
Holder, Arthur E., American Federation of Labor, statement of	118
Lichtliter, Rev. M. D., National Council Jr. O. U. A. M., statement of	489-501
Marshall, Louis, New York, statement of	317-318
Norton, Charles D., Treasury Department, receipts from head tax	131
Patten, J. H., Boston, Mass., statement of	31-53-79
Sabath, Hon. A. J., statement of	467-488
Soleau, W. L., Commerce and Labor, tables showing head tax	133-136
Weitzel, John J., National Council Jr. O. U. A. M.	501-507
Wolff, Simon, Washington, statement of	275

IMMIGRANT FUND.

Patten, J. H., Boston, Mass., statement of	34
Cable, Benj. S., Commerce and Labor, statement of	96-111

ILLITERACY.

Burnett, Hon. J. L., statement of	383-414
Griffith, Wm. B., New York Jr. O. U. A. M., statement of	67
Harrison, Hon. F. B., statement of	375-378
Holder, Arthur E., American Federation of Labor, statement of	113
Keliher, Hon. J. A., statement of	366-375
Lichtliter, Rev. M. D., National Council Jr. O. U. A. M., statement of	489-501
Marshall, Louis, New York, statement of	324-325
Patten, J. H., Boston, Mass., statement of	68-75-84-95
Sabath, Hon. A. J., statement of	467-488
Sanders, Leon, New York, statement of	337-339
Svare, Ven, Cleveland, Ohio, statement of	332-337
Weitzel, John J., National Council Jr. O. U. A. M., statement of	501-507
Wolf, Simon, Washington, D. C., statement of	275-277

MORAL TURPITUDE.

Parsons, Hon. Herbert, statement of	61-65
---	-------

NATURALIZATION.

	Page.
Discharged sailors, soldiers, etc.....	1-29-141-149

SEPARATION OF FAMILIES.

Sulzer, Hon. William, statement of.....	53-55
Goldfogle, Hon. Henry M., statement of.....	56-61

STEERAGE RATES.

Patten, J. H., Boston, Mass., statement of	32-43-44-45
--	-------------

LABOR AGENTS.

Quackenbos, Mrs. Mary Grace, New York, statement of.....	415-467
--	---------



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 012 321 190 A

